

SOUTH DAKOTA

Will C. Bromwell to be postmaster at Wessington Springs, S. Dak., in place of W. C. Bromwell. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1924.

Lewis W. Ford to be postmaster at Wakonda, S. Dak., in place of L. W. Ford. Incumbent's commission expired April 14, 1924.

C. Albert Zeitner to be postmaster at Mission, S. Dak., in place of C. A. Zeitner. Office became third class April 1, 1924.

TEXAS

Oliver P. Maricle to be postmaster at Wichita Falls, Tex., in place of Ed Howard. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1924.

William M. Willis to be postmaster at Timpson, Tex., in place of Lula Ezell. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1924.

Lillie M. Ragsdale to be postmaster at Richardson, Tex., in place of L. A. Pyeatt. Incumbent's commission expired April 9, 1924.

Dunn R. Emerson to be postmaster at Marlin, Tex., in place of C. H. Hamilton. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1924.

Alois J. Skarda to be postmaster at Bloomington, Tex., in place of G. H. Kindred. Incumbent's commission expired April 9, 1924.

Jesse P. Smith to be postmaster at Smiley, Tex., in place of J. W. Pouncey. Office became third class January 1, 1924.

Edgar W. Hargett to be postmaster at Richards, Tex., in place of J. L. Montgomery. Office became third class April 1, 1923.

Clara C. White to be postmaster at Megargel, Tex., in place of C. C. White. Office became third class January 1, 1924.

George F. Bates to be postmaster at Lyons, Tex., in place of G. F. Bates. Office became third class April 1, 1924.

James D. Heaton to be postmaster at Barry, Tex., in place of J. D. Heaton. Office became third class April 1, 1924.

WEST VIRGINIA

Crawford E. White to be postmaster at Triadelphia, W. Va., in place of S. J. Armstrong. Office became third class January 1, 1924.

WYOMING

Epsie L. Winn to be postmaster at Superior, Wyo., in place of James Syme, declined.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 12, 1924

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE

Paul E. Bellamy to be register of the land office at Rapid City, S. Dak.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY

Patrick Henry Hudgins to be captain, Veterinary Corps.
Harry Donnell Ayres to be captain, Infantry.
Daniel Philip Buckland to be first lieutenant, Cavalry.
Philip McIlvaine Whitney to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
John Morris Works to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Read Wipprecht to be captain, Ordnance Department.
Duncan Hodges to be first lieutenant, Signal Corps.
Ernest Byron Thompson to be second lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps.

Felix Nicholson Parsons to be second lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps.

Lutz Wahl to be assistant to The Adjutant General, with rank of brigadier general, Adjutant General's Department.

Harry Taylor to be Chief of Engineers, with rank of major general, Corps of Engineers.

Edgar Jadwin to be assistant to Chief of Engineers, with rank of brigadier general, Corps of Engineers.

Irving Moriarty to be major on retired list of the Regular Army.

Henry Benton Saylor to be major, Ordnance Department.

William Ward Wise to be captain, Chemical Warfare Service.

Christian Hildebrand to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Joseph Holleman Warren to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Edgar Mortimer Gregory to be first lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps.

John David Frederick to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Richard Ray Coursey to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Horace Joseph Caterer to be first lieutenant, Medical Administrative Corps.

Louis Augustus Carter to be chaplain, with rank of major.

James Alexander Smart to be first lieutenant, Medical Corps.

William Wayne Murphey to be first lieutenant, Ordnance Department.

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

James A. Jones, Phoenix.

CONNECTICUT

Frank J. Serena, Saugatuck.

IDAHO

Edith M. Smylie, Genesee.

John P. Eimers, Grangeville.

INDIANA

Alexis G. Coffman, Roachdale.

John N. Hunter, South Bend.

KENTUCKY

Ed J. Salm, Hawesville.

Clyde S. England, Russell.

LOUISIANA

Annie B. Netterville, Newellton.

Daniel Crowe, Vivian.

MONTANA

Margaret McGlumphy, Sumatra.

NEW JERSEY

Harriet C. Rosenkrans, Branchville.

Anne W. Campbell, Tabor.

WISCONSIN

Charles L. Calkins, Rhinelander.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1924

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Lord and our God, again within the shadow of Thy presence all alarms have been stilled. We therefore with quiet confidence come before Thee with thanksgiving. Settle and fix our plans and purposes with Thy wisdom. Within the peaceful folds of Thy Spirit, give counsel. Grant that all our achievements may bear the mark of a high and splendid Christian faith. In every situation may we know that Thy arm is sufficient and our defense is sure. In the name of Jesus we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, May 10, 1924, and Sunday, May 11, 1924, was read and approved.

CONFEDERATE MEMORIAL EXERCISES

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, on the 25th of May, at Arlington Cemetery, in the Confederate section, will be held Confederate memorial day services. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILSON] will deliver the address. I am requested by the commander of the Confederate Veterans' Camp, No. 171, to deliver an invitation to Congress to be present on that occasion. I will read the invitation:

HEADQUARTERS CAMP NO. 171, U. C. V.,
CONFEDERATE MEMORIAL HOME,
1322 VERMONT AVENUE NW.,
Washington, D. C., May 9, 1924.

To the United States House of Representatives:

Camp 171 United Confederate Veterans of Washington respectfully invites the Members of the House of Representatives to attend the Confederate Memorial Day services at Confederate section, Arlington National Cemetery, at 3 p. m., Sunday, May 25, 1924.

Very respectfully,

FRED BEALL,
Commander Camp 171, U. C. V.

It gives me great pleasure to extend this invitation on behalf of Camp 171, United Confederate Veterans.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Welch, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 6715) to reduce and equalize taxation, to provide revenue, and for other purposes, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles,

in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

S. 2676. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to lease or in his discretion to convey by quitclaim deed a certain tract of land in the military reservation of Santa Rosa Island, Fla.; and

S. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution authorizing and permitting the State of Arkansas to construct, maintain, and use permanent buildings, rifle ranges, and utilities at Camp Pike, Ark., as are necessary for the use and benefit of the National Guard of the State of Arkansas.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 2676. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to lease or in his discretion to convey by quitclaim deed a certain tract of land in the military reservation of Santa Rosa Island, Fla.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 112. An act providing for a comprehensive development of the park and playgrounds system of the National Capital; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minority members of the Committee on Insular Affairs be given five days to file minority views on the bill H. R. 8856, to enable the people of the Philippine Islands to adopt a constitution and form a government for the Philippine Islands and to provide for the future political status of the same.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that he may have five days to file minority views on House bill 8856. Is there objection?

Mr. DYER. Reserving the right to object, I would like to know what the expectations of the gentlemen are as to having the bill referred to taken up in the House for consideration, or whether it is to be permitted to sleep continuously until the Congress expires?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. The chairman of the committee begs leave to inform the gentleman that he will use every effort possible to bring the bill before the House at this session.

Mr. DYER. Has the committee authorized the gentleman to ask for a rule?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. The committee has authorized me to use every parliamentary means to secure action on the bill.

Mr. DYER. That does not include authority to ask for a rule. I suggest to the gentleman that he ask authority of the committee to get a rule from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

THE GREAT NORTHWEST

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to address the House for one minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I want to announce to the Members of the House that to-night, at 8 o'clock, in the caucus room, third floor of the House Office Building, one of the best orators of the country will speak. There is no admission fee and there will be no collection. Frank Branch Riley, of Portland, Oreg., will speak on "The Lure of the Great Northwest." I urge every Member of the House to be present. It will be time profitably spent.

EXTENSION OF STREETS NEAR WALTER REED GENERAL HOSPITAL

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 114) to vacate certain streets and alleys within the area known as the Walter Reed General Hospital, District of Columbia, and to authorize the extension and widening of certain streets.

Mr. STALKER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that no quorum is present. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to; the Doorkeeper closed the doors, and the Sergeant at Arms was authorized to bring in absent Members.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anderson	Doughton	Little	Sanders, N. Y.
Bacharach	Doyle	Lowrey	Schafer
Black, N. Y.	Drane	McDuffie	Sears, Fla.
Bloom	Edmonds	McFadden	Sears, Nebr.
Boies	Fish	McNulty	Seger
Boylan	Funk	MacLafferty	Sherwood
Britten	Gallivan	Magge, Pa.	Sinnott
Browne, N. J.	Garber	Mead	Sites
Browne, Wis.	Geran	Michaelson	Snyder
Burdick	Gilbert	Miller, Ill.	Stengle
Butler	Graham, Pa.	Mills	Strong, Pa.
Cable	Greene, Mass.	Montague	Sullivan
Campbell	Griffin	Moore, Va.	Sweet
Canfield	Hammer	Moore, Ind.	Swing
Carew	Haugen	Morin	Swoope
Casey	Howard, Okla.	Morris	Taber
Celler	Huddleston	Mudd	Tague
Clark, Fla.	Hull, Morton D.	Newton, Minn.	Taylor, Colo.
Cleary	Hull, William E.	O'Connell, N. Y.	Upshaw
Collins	Humphreys	Paige	Vare
Connolly, Pa.	Jeffers	Park, Ga.	Ward, N. C.
Corning	Kahn	Peavey	Ward, N. Y.
Crowther	Kelly	Perkins	Wason
Cullen	Kendall	Perlman	Watson
Curry	Kless	Quayle	Welsh
Darrow	LaGuardia	Ransley	Williams, Tex.
Davey	Langley	Reed, W. Va.	Wilson, La.
Deal	Lehlbach	Rogers, N. H.	Winslow
Dempsey	Lilly	Rosenbloom	Winter
Dickstein	Lindsay	Rouse	Yates

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and twelve Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 114, and, pending that, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to two hours, to be confined to the purposes of the bill, that one half of the time be controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] and the other half by myself.

Mr. CRAMTON. The Speaker, reserving the right to object, we hear a good deal in the newspapers about the need of more legislation for the District and the demands the District Committee are going to make for an extra day, and all that sort of thing. Why is it necessary to have two hours of general debate on every more or less unimportant bill that comes up from that committee? The bill before us does not require two hours of debate.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will say to the gentleman, the acting chairman of the committee felt he was forced to ask for that length of time for general debate. Personally I prefer to confine it to 30 minutes, but there are certain Members of the House who are opposed to the bill—

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WINGO. When the House adjourned on Saturday it was dividing on the hospital bill. What is the status of that bill?

The SPEAKER. That was on the rule.

Mr. WINGO. The House was in the midst of a division on that. What is its status; does it come up this morning?

The SPEAKER. It comes up when the chairman of the Rules Committee calls it up again.

Mr. WINGO. In other words, we await the action of the Chairman of the Rules Committee?

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman from Maryland will yield further, I do not feel it is the business of other Members of the House to protect the committee against itself. It seems to me that the Committee on the District, if it wants to get a number of bills through, ought to be able to content itself with a less extended general debate. However, I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I would like to ask if the bill which the gentleman proposes to call up is the one proposing to open up Fourteenth Street and through Walter Reed Hospital?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. It is the bill closing four or five streets.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. But opening up Fourteenth Street through the Walter Reed Hospital. Is that the bill?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. It ought to take about one minute to discuss that.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask if this bill has not been debated at some length at a prior time? I am sure I heard some vigorous speeches in relation to it.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. There have been only about 15 minutes' debate, during the last session of the Congress, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think 15 minutes is enough for the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I want to state to the gentleman from Michigan that there is quite a strong contest over this bill, and I have been requested for 55 minutes of the time against the bill. With the understanding the gentleman from Maryland and myself had in regard to the time I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman whether I can get 10 minutes of that time?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, of course, I should like to announce to the House that I shall offer some time this afternoon the conference report on the immigration bill carrying out the instructions of the House and shall call the bill up on Thursday immediately after the disposition of the business on the Speaker's desk.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland that general debate on this bill be limited to two hours, half to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas and half by himself? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 114, with Mr. SANDERS of Indiana in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 114, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 114) to vacate certain streets and alleys within the area known as the Walter Reed General Hospital, District of Columbia; and to authorize the extension and widening of Fourteenth Street from Montague Street to its southern terminus south of Dahila Street, Nicholson Street from Thirteenth Street to Sixteenth Street, Colorado Avenue from Montague Street to Thirteenth Street, Concord Avenue from Sixteenth Street to its western terminus west of Eighth Street west, Thirteenth Street from Nicholson Street to Piney Branch Road, and Piney Branch Road from Thirteenth Street to Butternut Street, and for other purposes.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill which is pending before the committee has received the unanimous approval of the District of Columbia Committee of the Senate; it has been unanimously passed by the Senate; it has the approval of the War Department and the Secretary of the War Department; it has been unanimously approved by members of the Federal Highway Commission—

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Not just now; in a moment.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. The gentleman does not want to make a misstatement.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. The gentleman will certainly allow me to make a brief statement, and I will be glad to yield. It has been unanimously approved by the District Commissioners and by the members of the Federal Highway Commission. It has been unanimously approved by the civic and trade organizations of the District of Columbia. It has practically the unanimous approval of the citizens of the northwest section of the city of Washington and of the adjacent Maryland territory. It provides for the closing of five streets through Walter Reed Hospital Reservation, including Thirteenth and Fifteenth Streets, as carried on the plan of the permanent Highway Commission of the District of Columbia.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. In a moment I will be glad to yield.

It is not proposed in the plan submitted by the Surgeon General's office to extend Fourteenth Street, which has been referred to by the gentleman from Texas, through Walter Reed Hospital. It is proposed to extend it through what is known as the medical center, between the museum and the out center and the faculty officers' quarters, according to the plan submitted by the Surgeon General's office. It is not proposed by the Surgeon General's office in the plan they have submitted to put any part of the hospital proper on that portion of the ground between Fourteenth and Sixteenth Streets, but it is proposed that on the Sixteenth Street end of the reservation there shall be a museum, a library, a faculty officers' quarters, and other buildings of the hospital proper will be placed between Fourteenth Street and Georgia Avenue. As a matter of fact, they are in closer proximity to the existing car line on Georgia Avenue than they are to Fourteenth Street.

I want to quote here from the statement of Col. Charles W. Kutz, of the United States Army, formerly engineer commissioner of the District of Columbia. He says:

If the plan in mind—that is, the putting of Fourteenth Street through Walter Reed Hospital at a lowered grade, so that the main walks and drives of the hospital can be carried overhead on bridges—if that were not in mind, if it were a question of putting through Fourteenth Street at grade, I believe the commissioners would indorse wholeheartedly the view expressed here this morning that it would be a great mistake; that it would be a serious mistake to reproduce within those grounds the conditions which exist to-day on Georgia Avenue.

But in suggesting a depressed grade we believe that we are safeguarding the patients against accident; that we are not interfering with the development of these grounds as a park; and that, in addition to serving a large territory to the north of Walter Reed Hospital, we will also provide very convenient means of transportation for the hospital people themselves.

Then, too, if the extension of Fourteenth Street meant the extension of a street through the hospital proper, it, too, might be criticized as being so objectionable as being unworthy of consideration.

But, as we understand the purpose in mind, it is intended to create on this reservation a medical center; not only a hospital but a medical school, a nurses' training institution, a museum, and a library, in addition to officers' quarters.

As we understand the tentative plans, all these auxiliary activities are proposed to be placed within the area between Fourteenth and Sixteenth Streets, and that all the hospital buildings—the hospital itself—will lie between Fourteenth Street extended and Georgia Avenue. So that what is proposed is not a street through a hospital but a street through a medical center, avoiding the hospital, but furnishing easy means of communication to both groups of activity.

We believe that the hospital people themselves as recently as 1917 contemplated the eventual opening of Fourteenth Street. If you will examine the plan you will find that, even as to the temporary buildings, not one of them is built within the lines of Fourteenth Street, but they are carefully arranged on both sides of the street, evidently indicating the contemplation of a highway, though not necessarily a public highway.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. In a moment. I read further:

We are greatly interested in the hospital. We do not want to do anything that will mar its development or interfere with its use as a hospital; but we do believe that the people to the north will eventually require greater transportation facilities than will be available on Georgia Avenue and Fourteenth Street alone.

Now I want to say, for the information of the House, that the Walter Reed Hospital plans of development can not be carried out under the existing conditions, because Thirteenth Street and Fifteenth Street and the streets running from east to west on the reservation must be closed by act of Congress before this reservation can be developed. I want to make it clear, further, that already more than one-half of Fourteenth Street through this reservation is dedicated and opened by act of Congress, but before this reservation can be developed fully all these streets which are marked in blue on this map [indicating] from Fourteenth Street up to Alaska Avenue must be closed by act of Congress. The District has already expended a considerable amount of money in improving these streets, which will be closed entirely under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. KINDRED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. In a moment.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. I understand that the gentleman stated that the War Department favored this?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. I understand that General Ireland opposed it two years ago.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, and he certainly does not mean to say that one officer of the Army can make a policy for the whole department or would oppose a policy adopted by the War Department.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. The evidence given as to what effect that will have is the best evidence we can get.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Has the gentleman any information as to the attitude of General Ireland now, in view of the sweeping indorsement of this bill by the head of the Army?

I said formerly at one time that certain officers of the Army were opposed to this bill, and I was asked by the War Department who it was that gave me that information. If officers of the Army are opposed to this bill, they certainly have not indicated it to this committee having this legislation in charge.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. Does not the gentleman think that the evidence of the officers of the Medical Corps, when the question relates to a hospital, is much better evidence than that even of the Secretary of War or that of anyone who can not pass upon the medical effect of the proposal?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I have just stated that no medical officer has opposed the provisions of this bill.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. The head of it has.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. There is a question as to that.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I notice that the gentleman's bill provides that the grade of the streets on the hospital grounds shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of War. I understand the gentleman contemplates that this bill, when enacted, will result in a depressed road along the line of Fourteenth Street through the hospital grounds. Am I correct in that?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Through the medical center.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Would the gentleman object to changing the language of his bill so as to have it stipulated in the law that the grade must be depressed? Otherwise the Secretary of War would have the power to let the street run through on the same general level as the hospital grounds.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. If that would remove the opposition of certain Members of the House to this legislation, I would have no objection to it, but if it does not remove their objection I would not consent to that, although it is the purpose of the War Department and the plan of the District Commissioners.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If it would be the fair and proper thing to do, why not amend the bill by stipulating what you think ought to be done without its being expressly provided?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will come to that.

Mr. KINDRED. Does not the proposed change of the street as suggested by this measure conform to the general plan of development of the Walter Reed Hospital along the line of making it fireproof and anticipating the expenditure of a great deal of additional money there, in order to make the present inadequate frame buildings safe for patients?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will answer the gentleman by presenting him with a map prepared by the Surgeon General's office, upon which it is provided for the extension of this street through this section of the hospital reservation.

Mr. KINDRED. And plans are already under way and perhaps will be made soon, if not already made, to develop this along the line of a fireproof hospital?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes.

Mr. REECE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. REECE. It is contemplated in this development of the extension of the streets, that the hospital is going to be moved into that section?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. No. The hospital proper, according to the plans of the War Department, is to be built between Fourteenth Street and Georgia Avenue. This bill provides for the closing of those streets through the reservation and for the extension of Fourteenth Street through what is known as the medical center, subject to the approval of the Secretary of War.

Mr. REECE. It struck me as though this would be to the great detriment of the hospital.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will state to the gentleman that the Secretary of War, who is the chairman of the Federal Highway Commission, held public hearings on this question before ap-

proving this bill, and that this plan of closing these streets and extending this one street through the reservation has the approval of the Secretary of War, the War Department, and the Federal Highway Commission, composed of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Chief Engineers of the United States Army.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. The streets referred to that are to be closed through this hospital reservation are already, as a matter of fact, closed.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. They are physically closed; yes. But it requires an act of Congress to close the streets for all time.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. The real purpose of closing these streets by this bill is to open up Fourteenth Street through the reservation, and that is considered more important than the closing of the streets which are physically closed now. Is not that true?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. No. I will say to the gentleman that it is impossible for the War Department to mature its plans and begin construction until Congress by legislation closes these streets.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I agree with the gentleman as to the closing of these other streets, but I am against the proposition of opening up this one street. The War Department has never asked for the closing of these other streets before the Military Affairs Committee, if I remember correctly.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes; they have.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Nobody objects to the closing of these other streets, but some do object to the opening of Fourteenth Street.

As I understand it, the purpose of opening Fourteenth Street through the reservation is to permit the development of all that country north of there and the extension of additions which are being opened north of the Walter Reed Hospital. Now, I want to ask the gentleman this question: Can not the traction company approach the Walter Reed Hospital down Fourteenth Street to the south boundary line of the reservation, go west and cross under Sixteenth Street at the large canyon or gully there, go up the west side of Sixteenth Street until they strike Alaska Avenue, and go out Alaska Avenue and give the people all the service they will get by going through the Walter Reed Hospital Reservation?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will say to the gentleman that the plan of opening Fourteenth Street through the reservation is the plan of the Army engineers, and that plan has been submitted to all concerned and has their approval.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. It has been considered by all concerned; but it would cost \$60,000 more to follow the other route. That is the only difference, is it not?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. No; there is more difference in it than that.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. What is the difference in serving those people?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Oh, there is a material difference in serving these people.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Did the District Committee insist that this bill be given consideration to-day and why is it brought up ahead of other legislation that is pending before that committee?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will say to the gentleman that this bill has been on the calendar for some months and was on the program submitted to the majority leader as being one of the bills which we desired to bring before the House. This bill has given way to the rent bill and other legislation since it has been on the order of business. The members of the District Committee are unable to understand the opposition to this bill, which has been carefully considered by competent authorities of the District and which has the approval of the Secretary of War and every legally constituted authority to deal with this subject. It has the unanimous approval of the District Committee of the Senate and the unanimous approval of the District Committee of the House. It was unanimously passed by the Senate, and we certainly urge the enactment of this bill into law.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. If the gentleman will yield I can explain my opposition. It is simply because I do not think it is for the best interests of the veterans in that hospital.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. In answer to that I will say to the gentleman that competent Army officers—who certainly must have at heart the welfare of the veterans and the sick—have gone on record publicly as advocating this as the best method of solving this problem and of keeping an additional avenue of

entrance into the District open for the rapidly growing sections in northwest Washington and the adjacent territory in Maryland.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. I could not hear the question asked by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], but I assume it is along the same line of the one I have in mind. I want to ask the gentleman from Maryland whether or not in the consideration of this bill there were any representatives of the American Legion, the Veterans' Bureau, or the Disabled Veterans of the United States, who took part in the World War, who appeared before the committee and asked that this bill go through.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will say to the gentleman, no, and there was not a single resident of the District or a single veteran or member of the American Legion who has ever voiced opposition to this measure. The only opposition is the opposition voiced by the members of the Military Affairs Committee and other Members of the House. I have not heard a single objection raised by any veteran or any resident of the District.

Mr. McKENZIE. Was there any notice given?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. The matter was carried in the papers and everybody was familiar with it.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes.

Mr. JONES. If the District docket is as crowded as the gentleman has been stating it is, could not the committee find something more important than the opening of a street to take up the time of the House on probably the last District day of the session?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will say to the gentleman that this bill does not only open one street but it closes six streets, which must be closed before the Government can go ahead with its program of construction. This matter is of vital importance not only to the District but to the Federal Government, and it has been on the calendar for months.

Mr. JONES. To run a street through Walter Reed Hospital?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. This bill not only closes five streets through the Walter Reed Reservation, but it provides for the opening up of many streets in that vicinity, in the northwest section of the city. It is a matter of tremendous interest to the city of Washington.

Mr. JONES. Is there a provision in this bill which will keep them from ever building a street-car track through these grounds?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. No; the bill states that the plan is to be subject to the approval of the Secretary of War.

Mr. JONES. But there is nothing to keep them from building street-car tracks through there if they want to?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. No, sir. There has been a tremendous development in the northwest section of the city, and owing to the extension of other streets being blocked by Rock Creek Park, the Soldiers' Home, Rock Creek Cemetery, and the Columbia Institution for the Deaf, the only extension into that growing section of Maryland at present is Georgia Avenue with its single car line, and this extension means still further development of the northwest section north of the hospital reservation, and the solving of the housing problem in the District will be materially hastened.

Since the adoption of the permanent highway plan for the District of Columbia, it has been carried out with only minor changes, and with the exception of Thirteenth Street and Fifteenth Street, which are closed through the reservation, under the provisions of this bill.

In a few years Georgia Avenue will certainly become the most crowded street leading into Washington, and the closing of Fourteenth Street would materially handicap the entire northwest section of Washington, as it is essentially needed to help accommodate the traffic of the future.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER].

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, to my mind this bill presents a most extraordinary proposition. I do not suppose that in any other city in the United States any such proposition as this would be seriously considered. Certainly no such proposition has ever been considered before even in the District of Columbia. You are all familiar with the Soldiers' Home. North Capitol Street is a great artery leading north from the Capitol, but there never has been any suggestion of an extension of North Capitol Street through the Soldiers' Home grounds. The cars go around through Michigan Avenue.

It is said that it is necessary to develop the real estate from the present end of Fourteenth Street northward to the Walter Reed Hospital grounds. This can be done without extending this street, with its frequent, noisy street cars, through the grounds, and it would not make two minutes' difference in the time of travel on Fourteenth Street.

Here is a map. Here is Georgia Avenue, here is Sixteenth Street, and here is Fourteenth Street. There is absolutely no reason why they can not extend Fourteenth Street to the southern boundary of the hospital grounds and then, through an arrangement with the War Department, skirt the southern and western boundaries of the Walter Reed Hospital grounds so that the cars can swing around on a curve without interfering with Sixteenth Street and then proceed northward. In other words, there could be a wider avenue for just a short distance on Sixteenth Street and along Alaska Avenue, constructed on land now belonging to the Government, until you get north of the hospital grounds, and then the extension of Fourteenth Street can be continued. It would not take two minutes longer for the traveling public.

The only argument in favor of extending this great thoroughfare through the middle of this hospital reservation where so many of the veterans of the World War are being cared for is that by so doing you can save two minutes and there will be a straight street instead of a little detour. I do not think that the proposition need any more than be stated to show its unwisdom; and I want to state, Mr. Chairman, that I would vote against it if I was the only Member of the House to do so.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. Does the gentleman think it is a good thing for nervous patients to have street cars running right through the reservation near the hospital?

Mr. DALLINGER. I think, in answer to my colleague, that it is a preposterous thing to have the continual noise of street cars through the hospital grounds. They will be obliged to remove some buildings, which they say are only temporary buildings, but everybody knows that this great thoroughfare, with a car line on it, is going right through the middle of the grounds.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The gentleman from Massachusetts recalls that at the hearings on the so-called Langley bill, which is the hospital building bill, it was stated that there would be approximately \$1,000,000 appropriated if that bill passes without amendment which would be utilized at Walter Reed Hospital, now under discussion.

Mr. DALLINGER. So I understand.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Would it not seem preposterous to the gentleman for the Government to expend \$1,000,000 in increasing the facilities of that hospital and then run a double-track street-car line through the very place where we are erecting these buildings?

Mr. DALLINGER. I should say such a proposition is perfectly preposterous and inconsistent.

Whether it was wise or unwise to select this particular location for this great veterans' hospital is not the question before us. That is a settled question. The land has been taken and the hospital buildings erected. There is this great reservation there with Georgia Avenue on one side and Sixteenth Street and Alaska Avenue on the other and it ought to remain intact just the same as the Soldiers' Home grounds.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the "Senator" yield?

Mr. DALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. RANKIN. This is really an Army hospital at any rate, is it not?

Mr. DALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. And it belongs to the Regular Army Establishment?

Mr. DALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. And it is not an emergency proposition?

Mr. DALLINGER. No.

Mr. RANKIN. Therefore, to run this street through there, it seems to me, would very likely interfere with the Regular Army operations from time to time.

Mr. DALLINGER. There is no doubt of it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Not only is it an Army hospital but the running of a street through there is recommended by the War Department, is it not?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, this proposition to dismember and divide the Walter Reed Hospital grounds is not a new proposition. It was referred to our committee, the Committee on Military Affairs, and, I think, very properly referred there, in 1921. At that time the Secretary of War and the War Department were all opposed to the proposition of opening a street through Walter Reed Hospital, for they sent a bill to our committee and asked us to close all the streets, including Fourteenth Street, and the communication was signed by the Secretary of War.

It is true that the Secretary of War has written a letter indorsing the proposition of opening the street known as Fourteenth Street through these grounds at the present time. I do not know what influenced the Secretary of War to change his mind. I do know that there has been a lobby here.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I will.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Does not the gentleman think the Secretary of War has come to realize the truth of the conditions at the Walter Reed Hospital? I will say that until I spent a month there I was against it, but when I saw the needs of the proposed extension I became in favor of it. I changed my mind.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I do not know what the gentleman thinks, but if he thinks that this is a good thing for mental patients, to have a street car running alongside the hospital, he has no comprehension of the needs of mental patients.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield again for me to explain that this proposed line is to run through the administration part and not through the part occupied by mental patients.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Oh, the gentleman was there for a few days, but he does not know anything about it.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I was not there as a mental patient.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I think the gentleman ought to have been; he ought to be sent back. [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I want to say that this proposed extension goes entirely through the administration portion of the hospital grounds.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. If the gentleman will sit down a minute, I want to say that the gentleman did not examine the Walter Reed grounds and does not seem to know. Now, here on this plan you will see Fourteenth Street, and here is the psychopathic hospital over here for mental patients. That is where the gentleman ought to have been. [Laughter.]

But, all joking aside, is it not absurd? Did you ever hear anything like it? Did any of you ever hear of running a street-car system through hospital grounds? Go into any city where there is a hospital and you will see signs saying that this is a zone of quiet. They get them as far away as they can from the street-car system. Here is a proposition to permit the street-car system to run through the Walter Reed Hospital grounds, and here on this chart you will see the psychopathic hospital with hundreds of patients in it.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is it not a fact that it is only about three or four blocks away from Sixteenth Street?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Two blocks from Fourteenth to Sixteenth Street. You have only 100 acres there, and just the minute you permit that street to go through you take off over 30 acres of the most valuable part of the grounds, and you will practically ruin the entire hospital grounds that you have already spent millions of dollars upon and are going to spend millions of dollars more.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. If you permit this street-car system to run through there, how long will it be before they will be appealing to Congress to move the hospital grounds?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. That is what the real-estate men expect to do just as soon as they get this divided up. They have already picked out the ground and they are going to ask Congress to buy other grounds.

Mr. McSWAIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. McSWAIN. Have the real-estate men other plans available for hospital sites?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes; I think they have them all picked out now.

Now, if you look at this map you will see Thirteenth Street; here is Fourteenth Street, and Fourteenth Street up to the present time is opened up to this point. We have bought the

additional ground recently and have asked to close all these streets. They were all being closed, including Fourteenth Street, up to this point, so as to make one compact hospital ground.

Mr. THATCHER. Is there any street car now running through the hospital grounds?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. No; and you do not want them. You do not want a street-car line in the grounds at all. They do go right by the grounds. I want to say that at the time General Ireland was before our committee, General Glennan, the commandant at the hospital, was before our committee, and some others, and we investigated this very thoroughly. I went out there five or six times. I took some of the best experts on hospitals in this country and asked them to investigate and let me know what they thought of it, and not one person that I asked an opinion of indorsed it. They all said that it was absurd to propose any such thing as to divide these hospital grounds.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I will.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Does the Surgeon General of the Army approve this bill?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The Surgeon General as far as I know does not approve of it at the present time, but the gentleman from Texas knows that it is somewhat embarrassing for an officer of the Army to contradict or to differ from those higher up, and I presume he would decline to do so at this time.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. In such a case would not the Secretary of War be more apt to defer to the Surgeon General than the Surgeon General would be afraid to express his opinion to the Secretary of War?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. If he had he would not have recommended putting this through, because the Surgeon General in the hearings on June 2, 1921, very explicitly went on record as opposed to the proposition.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. The hospital authorities having passed on this unfavorably, the gentleman does not have the idea that Congress is going to overrule the judgment of those men and put the street-car line through these hospital grounds.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I have some confidence in Congress and I hope it will defeat the proposition here emphatically so that we will never hear of it again. It should not have been brought in here at this time.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I think they will.

Mr. KING. If the gentleman will yield for an inquiry, is it not the fact that there is a double line of street cars running the entire length of the hospital grounds on Georgia Avenue?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. KING. Is it not a fact that during the war that leads up to the present time nearly all the activities of the hospital have taken place along that street-car line?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. It does now.

Mr. KING. Does the gentleman know what the hospital authorities think of the sound of the street cars, what effect it has upon psychopathic patients?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Whenever they place a hospital they place it away from sound. They do not put a hospital right up against a street-car line and they never did. They get the hospital just as far away from the street as it is possible.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. When I went up for observation they put me right up to the street cars on Georgia Avenue.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. That is to deaden the sound. [Laughter.]

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I want to read you what General Ireland said in the hearings on June 2, 1921.

The people who want this railroad put through the reservation, of course, have an interest in securing transportation north of the reservation.

Now, you see at that time they wanted transportation north of the reservation. That is what they want to-day, and that is the only reason this bill comes in here, that the street-car company wants a short cut and does not want to go to the expense of building the street-car line around by the Walter Reed Hospital grounds. Now, I have no objection to the building up of Washington, but I do not think it is necessary when you do that to destroy beautiful hospital grounds such as you have at Walter Reed. I think it is a mistake, and I hope that this Congress will not go on record as favoring

any such absurd proposition. I yield back the remainder of my time. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back four minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time we are to yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] may be controlled by him.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the time yielded to the gentleman from Illinois—

Mr. BLANTON. That the time to be yielded to him by me and the gentleman from Maryland be controlled by him.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the time yielded by himself and the gentleman from Maryland to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] may be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois. Is there objection?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Reserving the right to object, how much time is that?

Mr. BLANTON. Twenty-five minutes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. It does not extend the two hours?

Mr. BLANTON. No; it does not extend it at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield the gentleman from Illinois 10 minutes.

Mr. ZIEHLMAN. I yield the gentleman 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I shall not consume very much time in this discussion. It is a matter that is so simple to my mind that I feel it is really in a sense a waste of time to take two hours in discussing it. If there were really any necessity for this legislation, or if it were to be legislation that would be of assistance for all the people concerned, I might be willing to sacrifice my views to some extent, so far as the patients in the hospital are concerned. But, gentlemen, there is no real necessity for this legislation, and in my judgment a much better solution of this can be had than is provided in this bill. You understand, of course, that Sixteenth Street bounds the Walter Reed Hospital grounds on the west side. Across Sixteenth Street is Rock Creek Park and the Zoo. Now, over here, some distance south of the hospital grounds, there is a ravine, and up here [indicating on map] there is another depression under Sixteenth Street. Now, the solution that ought to be made of this problem is for the street-car line to come up Fourteenth Street to a point near the south boundary of the hospital grounds, come across, go under Sixteenth Street, build a station in the park for unloading people who want to visit the park, thence paralleling Sixteenth Street to the ravine or depression under Sixteenth Street, thence passing under Sixteenth Street, going up Alaska Avenue to Fourteenth Street and out, and in that way they will accommodate the people who wish to visit the park by landing them in the park. You know, if you have been out along Sixteenth Street, that a man takes his life in his hand when he wishes to cross. People who wish to go and visit the park and land on the opposite side have to cross Sixteenth Street. The plan I suggested would land them right in the park and would take care of those who wished to visit the hospital grounds. The only objection I think, perhaps, is the expense. The engineers who testified in the hearing which was held in 1921 estimated that the plan would cost perhaps \$280,000.

The plan to cut a depression through Walter Reed Hospital grounds will cost possibly \$200,000. Another plan that was suggested this morning was simply to come around through Walter Reed Hospital grounds, which would destroy the park effect of the ground, and that ought not to be done. Now, gentlemen, there were some statements made here this morning that the Secretary of War and that the Surgeon General of the United States Army have changed their minds with regard to this subject. It may be the Secretary of War has changed his mind, but I can understand how Army officers change their minds. My 12 years' experience on the Committee on Military Affairs has taught me that Army officers have one opinion in their hearts and another one which they often express publicly when they come before committees, and that is to express what is supposed to be the wishes of the War Department, which is no reflection on an officer. No man can sit on this floor to-day and convince me that General Ireland, that splendid Surgeon General of our Army, favors this outrage. Not for one minute. It may be that they have silenced his tongue. It may be that he is not out making speeches against this thing. But in his heart I am sure that he feels just as he did when he appeared before

our committee on June 2, 1921. And I want to read to you what he said then. I asked him this question:

Do you contend that the noise from street cars, such as we are having now from cars going up and down the street here—and I will say that that noise is such that as you are speaking at that end of the table those of us who happen to be in this corner of the room can not hear what you are saying—do you contend that that sort of noise has a detrimental effect upon the patients in the hospital, especially if they happen to be nervous patients?

General IRELAND. Yes, sir; most decidedly.

Mr. McKENZIE. That would be, at least, one reason why we should not permit the opening of this street to accommodate those gentlemen who, as Mr. MILLER has intimated, are interested in simply making a little more money out of some land which they have probably bought for speculative purposes?

Mr. MILLER. That was my suspicion.

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes; a suspicion, but it seems to have been a well-grounded suspicion. Why should these unfortunates who are compelled to remain out there for treatment be subjected to that sort of nuisance, when, as a matter of fact, the same object could be attained by going around the reservation? Those sick boys should have quiet and should be permitted to wander around through the reservation and sit under the shade of the trees without incurring the danger of being killed.

[Applause.]

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Wait until I give you his answer.

I read:

General IRELAND. You have stated the situation exactly. There are three outstanding reasons why the railroad should not go through this reservation: First, we must have a zone of quiet if we are to give the best treatment to sick people, and that is particularly true in the case of the nervous and mental cases. Then there is the danger of running street cars through the reservation, and we want to make part of this reservation a park where the patients can go out and spend the day. On such a day as this, for instance, patients that can be up and around have no business in the wards. They will do much better outside.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. Is it not our plain duty to consider the welfare of these patients instead of the street-railway people?

Mr. McKENZIE. Absolutely. And I want to say, gentlemen, that those were the sentiments of General Ireland in June, 1921, when he came before our committee. I know General Ireland well enough to know that those are his sentiments to-day, and will continue to be his sentiments. If those people up here were marooned and had no way of escape, I would not object to this measure; but by making a circle around there you will fulfill all that the necessities require, and that would be that they want to get this land back and then sell to the Government another hospital site.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. I was out in Walter Reed for two months, three years ago, and I may say that half of the boys asked me to do what I could against the proposed legislation suggested at this time.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Will the gentleman tell us who is back of this movement? Is there any public sentiment for it? What is it?

Mr. McKENZIE. Well, the petition at that time purported to come from the people living north of the hospital grounds, that they wanted transportation.

But here is something to keep in mind, gentlemen. This hospital was established in 1908 by the Congress of the United States. We went out there and bought ground. The land was a wilderness, a forest. We said it would be a beautiful place for a hospital. I agreed with that. We bought some land. Then we needed more land. We found if we wanted to make a great school out there we must have more land. We now have about 100 acres out there. We bought additional land, and the purpose of the Government was not only to make that a great hospital for the eastern part of our country, just as the Letterman Hospital is a great hospital for the western part of the country, but to make it a great school and something that the Nation can be proud of. And now, gentlemen, are we, at the behest of people for pecuniary interest or simply for convenience, to lay that all aside, cut down this forest, build up mansions out there where they can charge these exorbitant rates that they impose upon the people of the District, and benefit only a few people?

I want to appeal to you, gentlemen of the House, who are here, that we ought at least to stand here and defend the rights of those who can not come here and speak for themselves, and those are the boys who are out there receiving treatment. [Applause.]

If we do that, Fourteenth Street will never be opened through this ground, but which will ever be preserved for the invalids and the injured of our Army in the future as well as at present. [Applause.]

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. What is the feeling on the part of the patients in the hospital on this proposition?

Mr. McKENZIE. Of course, I can not answer that question. But if you dig a trench through there, you can imagine what it would be.

Mr. KNUTSON. It would cut the grounds in two.

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes. When the boys become convalescent, want to walk through these grounds, what would it be with a big cut dividing it? For God's sake let us have one place in Washington where a sick soldier can sit down under a tree and hear the birds sing without its being brought to our attention that somebody is trying to make money out of it. [Applause.]

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the enacting clause. However, I understand the motion must wait until the end of general debate.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I dislike very much to disagree with the distinguished acting chairman of my own committee, the Committee on Military Affairs, and I dislike also to disagree with my colleague on the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL]. I might say that he got me in the wrong part of the hospital in his remarks; but I want to say to this committee—and the only reason I rise is to say this—that before I had actual personal experience of conditions at Walter Reed Hospital I was just as strongly against this bill as the acting chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs or the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL].

I voted against it when it was before the Military Affairs Committee, but after I had seen the conditions in Walter Reed Hospital in reference to transportation and in reference to the location of this proposed street I changed my mind, and I feel strongly that this street should be cut through.

It is not necessary for me to say that I have no pecuniary interest in it. I own no real estate and I am affiliated with nobody who owns real estate. I am looking at this matter at the present time from the point of view of the inmates of the Walter Reed Hospital.

The situation is this: To the right of this blue print you see Sixteenth Street with no car lines, and there ought not to be any car lines there; to the left you see Georgia Avenue, which has car lines. Fourteenth Street, at the present time, runs from the northern to the southern limit of the Walter Reed Hospital Reservation. You are not now asked to consider anything except less than one-half of the indicated length of Fourteenth Street, because the existing law and the existing physical conditions already have opened Fourteenth Street more than half of its length. Fourteenth Street is now open from the "X" mark to the top of the map. The only part you are concerned with is the Fourteenth Street right from that "X" mark to the bottom of the map.

Now, what is the situation in the Walter Reed Hospital? I heard this talk about the sick soldiers before I saw Walter Reed Hospital. I am just as much for diverting the minds of sick soldiers with birds, trees, and other things, as is the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, who so feelingly spoke about those things. But I spent one month out there in a snow storm and I saw those men trying to get to town. There was no way to get to town; there is no decent transportation and there is no adequate transportation for the people in that reservation from the reservation to the city.

Now, what is the situation about disturbing the peace and quiet of the soldiers in the Walter Reed Hospital? Here is your administration building toward the left of the map, toward Georgia Avenue [indicating on map]. You have your street cars on Georgia Avenue. When I was at the Walter Reed Hospital I lived in this shack right here [indicating]. Now, that shack is comparatively near Georgia Avenue, and we could not hear the street cars and they did not disturb us. In that same shack were men who were about to die and two or three men died while I was there.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman tell us, for information, in the size of the ordinary block here, how far it is from the east side of that brick administration building over to Georgia Avenue, approximately?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I should say perhaps one or two blocks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, may I have one minute more?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for one additional minute.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Now, gentleman, the situation is this: Over here toward the right of the map you have not got the sick soldiers anywhere. Over toward the right of the map you have nothing except the administration building and you have no sick soldiers anywhere.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it not a fact that Thirteenth Street would run right through that administration building?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Thirteenth Street would absolutely ruin the whole place, and would run directly through it. So, gentlemen, I ask that you pass this bill in the interest of furnishing transportation to the men who have got to live there and do business in that hospital.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has again expired.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SUMMERS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, you have heard about this Fourteenth Street extension for a couple of years. It seems to me it is very largely a question of whether we are going to put real estate first or sick ex-service men first in our consideration. Now, that is really the problem that we are confronting at this time. I am for the ex-service men. Everybody who has traveled out to Walter Reed knows there is a street-car line coming right along by the corner of the hospital grounds, and busses are operating over on the other side. Except as a real-estate proposition I see no reason why the grounds should be marred by the construction of a street-car line through the midst of them. I see no reason why disabled men, who are there trying to regain their health, should be annoyed by the constant clatter of street cars. Everybody knows there is a quiet zone marked as you approach every hospital. Why should we deliberately arrange for the construction of a noisy street-car line right through the most important ex-service men's hospital in this part of the United States?

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. Would not the proposed Fourteenth Street line run right alongside of the neuropsychiatric part of the hospital, where the men need the most quiet?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I understand it would do so. It would not only annoy these patients constantly and harass their nerves but it would be a constant menace to many of those fellows who are crippled, some of the mentally and others physically, who would have to be crossing the tracks.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. As I have understood this matter—although I confess I have not given great study to it—it is to be a tunnel proposition?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. A tunnel would not be objectionable. My understanding is that part of it is to be bridged over but no tunnel constructed.

Mr. KNUTSON. It will be an open cut. The gentleman is a doctor, and I will ask the gentleman whether in his opinion the putting of Fourteenth Street through there and allowing street cars to operate would not retard the recovery of the patients because of the noise from the street cars?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Undoubtedly noise must retard the recovery of hospital patients or you would not universally see a quiet-zone sign posted as you approach every hospital.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is a physician himself?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. And the gentleman gives it as his medical opinion that running this street-car line through Fourteenth Street, which would bring it within one block of the main administration building and along certain wards, would be detrimental to the patients in that hospital?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. It is wholly because I believe it would be detrimental to the patients that I asked for two or three minutes time in which to oppose this proposal.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, a question on another point. Where there are patients using these grounds—convalescent patients—walking around the grounds, some of them affected mentally, would or would not carrying this double-track street-car line through Fourteenth Street within a block of the administration building and along these wards be dangerous to such patients?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I have just stated that, in my opinion, it would be not only a menace to their health but dangerous to their lives.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Would it be any more dangerous than the car line along Georgia Avenue?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Georgia Avenue is outside of the hospital grounds.

Mr. BLANTON. And Georgia Avenue is policed by military police.

Mr. WOODRUFF. There are street cars on Georgia Avenue now.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; and it is policed.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. And this would be adding an additional hazard.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM].

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, from what has been said one would believe that this street was immediately adjacent to where the patients are. The truth of it is this street is from one block to a block and a half from where the hospital wards are to be located.

Mr. STEPHENS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Let me start first.

Mr. STEPHENS. I want to say the hospital wards above there are right on Fourteenth Street.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman is in error. Here is a plat of the intended layout. Over here to the east are the wards of the hospital, a block away from this street. Here is a school between the wards and Fourteenth Street and student officers' quarters. On the west side of the street are the faculty officers, the library, and the museum. Therefore the patients in this hospital are from one block to a block and a half away from the proposed street, and there are no patients on the west side, but there is a library and a museum and one other building.

Remember also that this property on the west side of Fourteenth Street was not a part of the original hospital grounds. It has been subsequently purchased for other buildings—for the museum, for the library, and the faculty officers. Therefore the patients really have nothing to do with going over there, unless they want to go over to visit the library, the museum, or the faculty quarters. So that absolutely the entire hospital grounds are within the old purchase and not on the west side of Fourteenth Street, the subsequent purchase.

Remember another thing, this street is to be depressed. It is to be below grade.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. No; I decline to yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is that in the bill?

Mr. LINTHICUM. No; not in the bill, but guaranteed, and I should welcome such an amendment. This street is to be depressed. There are to be bridges across this street carrying those who want to visit the library, the museum, or the faculty quarters.

There was a public hearing on this matter. The hospital authorities voiced strenuous protest against the plan, and as a result, the Highway Commission, consisting of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, held a public hearing in the board room of the District Building on June 23, 1921, and subsequent after this full hearing the commission recommended the opening of Fourteenth Street through the reservation. It is absolutely indorsed not alone by the commissioners but also by the War Department, and the War Department will have charge of this hospital, which is an Army hospital.

Can anybody imagine that the Secretary of War would want to do something injurious to the patients of that hospital?

Gentlemen, there is another point you want to remember. Sixteenth Street and Fourteenth Street and Georgia Avenue are the only north and south streets possible between the east side of Rock Creek Park and the west side of Soldiers' Home, which means that they are the only north and south streets between Connecticut Avenue leading to Chevy Chase and Rhode Island Avenue leading to Hyattsville. Anyone who lives in the northwestern section of the city and comes down Sixteenth Street in the morning can realize that there must be additional accommodations for north and south traffic in the District of Columbia. Only this morning when I came down, the automobiles were lined up on Sixteenth Street waiting for the traffic officer to let them cross U Street for two blocks, and they were solid. I got through there in a space of about 18 inches between an automobile and about 2 feet between another line of automobiles. So that it is a matter of necessity that the District of Columbia, if she proposes to grow, must have additional accommodations for north and south traffic.

You have been talking here about high rents. You passed through this House the other day a bill extending the rent law, and yet if you do not give this additional traffic accommodation you can not build up that section of the territory to the satisfaction of home owners and residents of the District of Columbia and the building of homes in this section. I feel, with an automobile owned by almost everybody, with thousands of them on every hand, we must give additional traffic accommodations, and we must open up additional territory if the District of Columbia intends to grow, and grow she will. If she can not grow in this beautiful section out that way, she must grow in some other section, and I contend we ought to give these accommodations when by all who have studied this question, by the War Department, by the District of Columbia, by the citizens' associations, and by absolutely everybody who has studied the question, the opening of Fourteenth Street has been recommended, and not one veteran has opposed its opening.

Now, gentlemen, another thing: Do you not imagine that the patients themselves want additional transportation into Washington? It is a matter of impossibility for them to get on a Sixteenth Street bus in the morning, they are so congested.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. It is not only for the soldiers themselves, but for their wives, mothers, and families in Washington, who can not get to the Walter Reed Hospital easily.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I was coming to that point. As I say, you can not get on a Sixteenth Street bus coming to the city in the morning, and in the evening going out they are so congested that it is difficult. You can not get on a Georgia Avenue street car unless you hang by the strap or stand on the platform. It is not a question of giving the people generally transportation, but it is a question of giving the patients a chance to come into the city of Washington and go out. The friends of all the patients there do not own automobiles. What they want is an opportunity to go out and visit the patients in the hospital. They need transportation on Fourteenth Street to go and visit the patients just as much as the general public need transportation on Fourteenth Street to go beyond the hospital.

In conclusion, I want to say that you must bear in mind that all of the citizens' associations, the Secretary of War, and the people who have given the question deep study have been convinced that this street ought to be opened.

There is another thing we ought not to forget, and that is that while we are opening Fourteenth Street we are closing other streets; we are closing these other streets, which will give the hospital a solid block east of Fourteenth and up to Georgia Avenue, where all the patients are contained, and where all the administration buildings are contained, and where all the adjunct buildings except three are contained in that great body of ground. We close these other streets and give them a solid section for the hospital.

On the newly acquired property we give accommodation for the library, for the museum, for the faculty officers. I do not believe that the street is going to interfere one particle with any patients. I believe it is going to be a great accommodation to them, a great accommodation to their friends and relatives. I want to say to you that in the treatment of a patient one of the best doctors in the world is a visit from a dear friend who comes out to the hospital to see him. [Applause.] Medicines do a lot, medicines accomplish a great deal; but I tell you what the patients want in all diseases is a visit from their friends, and we should make it possible for their friends to visit them whenever and wherever they can. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Can not all of their friends visit them now; are they precluded?

Mr. LINTHICUM. If the gentleman will give me a minute, I will answer his question.

Mr. BLANTON. All my time is promised.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Well, the question answers itself.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to find myself in disagreement with some of my friends from Maryland, to whom this project evidently means a great deal. I am actuated, however, in opposing this bill by a sense of duty which, I believe, is predicated on a rather exceptional knowledge of the situation. I do not wish to arrogate to myself a more intimate knowledge concerning Walter Reed Hospital conditions than other Members of the House, but many Members of the House know that for years I visited almost daily that institution. In all of my experience and acquaintance with the conditions there, in all of my conversations with men at the hospital, I have never found an officer or a patient who did not insist that it was almost criminal to open Fourteenth Street through the hospital grounds. They may be wrong, they may be misled or misguided, but the officer personnel of that hospital, the afflicted soldiers and other patients who are there, as far as my personal contact has gone, have been invariably opposed to this project.

Now, gentlemen, it is said by various Members in discussing the bill that Fourteenth Street, when extended, will go through the hospital grounds on a grade lower than the general level of the hospital. There is not a word requiring that in the bill. All that is said in the bill is that the grade of the street through the hospital grounds shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of War. You and I can not say what the present Secretary of War may do or what some future Secretary of War might do. Just as the present Secretary of War, in spite of the advice of his own Surgeon General, was actuated to support this bill in its present form, so the present or future Secretary of War may later say, "I think it is perfectly proper to have this great boulevard teeming with street cars and automobiles traverse the hospital grounds on the general hospital level."

I suspect—and I hope I do no one an injustice—I suspect this language is drawn as it is in the bill on the very theory that later it may be possible to arrange to have that street put through on the same general level with the hospital grounds. If it was the intent of the people who advocate the bill to have the street depressed, why did not they say so? Nothing in the world could be easier than to set it forth in unmistakable language in the bill itself.

Here is a map which has been produced by the proponents of the bill. I want you to note the width of the hospital reservation between Sixteenth Street and Georgia Avenue. It is about the width of my thumb nail, about three-quarters of an inch wide. The maximum width of this hospital reservation from east to west is only a few hundred yards. I want you to contrast, if you will, the disparity between that thumb-nail width of the hospital and the great expanse to the east and west where other traffic arteries may be located.

Why in the world is it necessary to bisect that little space with all this region east and west of the hospital grounds available for the pushing through of highways for commerce, street cars, and motoring? I do not want to impair or impede the development of the important section to the north. We want to have a prosperous and growing community in the State of Maryland just beyond the District line. But I ask any man why in all conscience we must take this poor narrow line, a few hundred yards wide, out of all the possible opportunities and proceed to drive a great boulevard through at that one point. Is there any reason that appeals to the sense and judgment—to say nothing of the philanthropy and fair dealing—of Members of the House in that proposition? It is said that there is a plan that will put these hospital buildings as such on one side of Fourteenth Street extended, and certain other buildings, a part of the same general scheme, on the other side of Fourteenth Street extended. Who knows, gentlemen—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I have one additional minute?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield the gentleman one minute.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But who knows whether the present scheme is destined to be a permanent one, whether it is going to be one from which we should never deviate? Here we have a single hospital and reservation established by Congress, maintained by Congress, and I think worthy of the protection of Congress. Gentlemen, there can be no reason for

a step like this. The Surgeon General of the Army is on record against it. The commanding officer of the Walter Reed Hospital has been on record against it in the past. It is true Army officials can not be so vocal now, because the Secretary of War has taken an adverse position. The Secretary of War took that position on the advice of an Army engineer. The Army engineer likes to have a straight line instead of a curved line. The alternative would have involved a curved line. The Army engineer opposed it, and the Secretary of War indorsed the Army engineer. But is it not our duty to say we had rather protect the welfare and well-being of those men always, even at the expense of a slight curvature of the backbone of Fourteenth Street? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to have a quorum here to consider an important measure like this, and I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Three hundred and two Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, when I was a member of the Committee on Military Affairs substantially this same bill was brought before that committee. A unanimous action was taken against it; then when these proponents of the bill found that it could not possibly get through the Committee on Military Affairs that had charge of War Department property a switch was made and the same subject matter was reported on a subsequent bill through the Committee on the District of Columbia. That is the parliamentary situation. Now, the Walter Reed Hospital was established in 1908 for the purpose of making it a great American Army hospital. Forty-two acres of land were owned at that time, and subsequently this development was continued until something upward of 100 acres have been acquired, that extended fairly on the north to the Maryland line. I am exceedingly sorry to disagree with my friend from Maryland [Mr. ZIEHLMAN] on the merits of this proposition. Street cars can reach this territory by running up Georgia Avenue turning this way [illustrating] and turning to the west north of the hospital grounds and then on north. You can reach it this way by going around, as was suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER]. You can reach it this way out Georgia Avenue where there is a car line now turning the corner reaching this district in here that they want to reach now from Fourteenth Street. It does seem to me by extending the street-car line and the street and bisecting Walter Reed Hospital grounds you destroy practically all of this territory in here. An open cut is what is being devised not only for a double-track street-car line, but for vehicles as well, making it absolutely impossible to cross this thing except by approaches on bridges or whatever method the Government will find to be necessary to install. And by the way the Government is to pay for all this, too. Walter Reed Hospital was established for a great medical school ultimately, and it was thought only to take the land in the vicinity adapted to that purpose when the Congress bought it. Why you might as well ask to extend streets through the Capitol grounds or through the Soldiers' Home, or through Arlington Cemetery, or any other place that Congress has set apart with a sort of sanctity to it. Persons since 1908, living on this tract of land out there, thought that Fourteenth Street was barred, and any man who bought his land since that time had full knowledge that Fourteenth Street was not to extend through. Now, the real estate boomers have gone out in that country and bought the land and are trying to force this thing through. That was demonstrated when it came before the Committee on Military Affairs. Everyone coming before the Committee on Military Affairs on this proposition was opposed to it. General Ireland, as has been said over and over again, opposed the extension of this street. Now, General Ireland has been mellowed; I dare say, through the action of his superior officers and says it is up to the Congress, but I for one will never vote to cut Walter Reed Hospital in two and ruin it for the purpose that Congress had in view when it bought that site. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 8350) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes, in

which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

EXTENSION OF STREETS NEAR WALTER REED GENERAL HOSPITAL

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARRETT]. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I would gladly aid in the development of all of that part of the country out in Maryland north of Walter Reed Hospital, and also the District of Columbia, and would willingly help those people out in most any way that I could without disturbing the quiet of Walter Reed Hospital.

I am always glad to see development going on, and I am glad to see all those new homes being built out there. If there was any necessity even for the advancement of the building of these homes or for the opening up of this street I might content myself with remaining silent and letting this bill pass. But it is not necessary. No Member of Congress who has been north on Sixteenth Street and north on Fourteenth Street and Colorado Avenue but is familiar with this situation. He knows that it is not necessary, and the most that can be said of the proposition is that it is very desirable. I submit it to the judgment of this House that if there was no Secretary of War, if there was no General Ireland at the head of the Medical Corps, if there was nobody to make a recommendation and we were called upon to pass upon this question in the first instance, how many of us would say that Fourteenth Street should be opened and extended through this hospital? Here is a territory that has been segregated and set apart for disabled, sick, and afflicted soldiers from out of the World War, of whom our hospitals are full, of these suffering patriots who so unselfishly offered their lives for their country; how many of us would say, "Why, yes; let us run that street-car line right through that ground and put a double track on it, and in the morning hours, when these patients might want to rest, we will send a hundred street cars between 6 o'clock and 8.30 o'clock through those grounds, in order that the people out beyond there might be accommodated with street-car service and save them, as has been stated, about a minute and a half of time"? Not one of us would agree to it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. How many automobiles?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Oh, you just go out Sixteenth Street and if you want to know how many automobiles there are, go down to Sixteenth and U Streets and try to cross. It is a wonder to me that many pedestrians do not get killed at the crossing. There are in this hospital sick men of the World War.

There are men who went out to fight for their country and returned wounded, crippled, and disabled. You know this Congress said, "We will make you as comfortable as we can. We will erect a hospital and furnish you with everything that is necessary, and with the best hospital skill we can get in the Army, and we will give you a quiet place where you can recuperate and get well," and now does the same Congress, at the behest of real-estate development, propose to disturb those men and to permit the rattle of cars through there by the thousands and thousands every day, and by our action split Walter Reed Hospital grounds wide open with a double-track street-car system and permit automobiles and every kind of vehicles to thunder along those streets? To my mind it is unthinkable. The first time it was brought before the Committee on Military Affairs a map was laid down before us and General Ireland sat at the head of the table and pointed out the direful results that he believed would come to these patients if this street was opened up through this hospital. I made up my mind then and I said, "No; run this street somewhere else." It has been demonstrated over and over again that they can go from the southern boundary of the Walter Reed reservation on Fourteenth Street, west to Sixteenth Street, and cross under Sixteenth Street and proceed along the west side of Sixteenth Street to Alaska Avenue, and out Alaska Avenue north, and give the people in that section of the city and Maryland the same service that would be given if Fourteenth Street should be extended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. This bill does one important thing that the House ought not to overlook. It seeks to close a num-

ber of streets that ought to be closed. If you just strike out Fourteenth Street you will close them all.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I would close them all, Fourteenth Street as well as the others. As the others are already physically closed, all we have to do is to amend this bill and close up Fourteenth Street and end this controversy once for all, and let them understand they must proceed in some other manner.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the proponents of this bill want the bill if you strike out Fourteenth Street?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I do not think so.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I was going to suggest to strike out the enacting clause to show them just what we mean.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. If you strike out the enacting clause they will come back at another Congress. If you close up Fourteenth Street now it will remain closed until the Congress of the United States gets ready to move the hospital somewhere else. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. That is exactly what the War Department asked our committee to do.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Yes; in the first instance they asked that Fourteenth Street be closed up. Our committee was favorable to that, and I think it is favorable to it now, and I think the Congress would be favorable to it.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. If Fourteenth Street were opened, either the ground west could not be used for the badly crippled or else it would have to be crossed overhead?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. The gentleman is exactly right. There would be no safe way to cross Fourteenth Street, no matter whether depressed or on the level. If you have got street cars running through that ground the whole length of it, and automobiles, and everything else, no patient on earth would want to go to Walter Reed Hospital if he knew that such conditions existed.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Is there a street-car line on Georgia Avenue at the entrance?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. And they could increase the street-car service on that line, could they not?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. There is no question about that. There is no reason for opening Fourteenth Street, but for the fact of all that territory out there is to be built up and developed, which would be done easier by going through Walter Reed than by going around it.

I have no objection to the building up of that beautiful section of the city, but I say let them go around the sick men when they go home instead of going through this hospital ground set apart for them. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to be the only member of the committee to speak against this bill, and I also hesitate to speak against it when all the newspapers of Washington are for it and when all of the citizens' associations of Washington are for it, because I know that when they make up their minds to pass a bill we can hardly stop it. I know how unpopular it will make you to vote against their bill, and I know what it means to be unpopular with the Washington newspapers. [Laughter.] They sting you every time they get a chance; they bark at you continually; they demean you and try to belittle you all the time. That is what you get and the penalty you pay if you oppose them, but notwithstanding their continual unwarranted attacks, I oppose them whenever I think it is necessary and take my medicine like a man. But I am recompensed some after all. In my mail this morning I got a letter from a splendid gentleman in Pennsylvania and one from Maryland. They both said practically the same thing. They said, "BLANTON, do not let those Washington papers stop you from doing your work. Go on and do it, for every time they attack you they make you stronger with the people all over the country." So you, colleagues, should not be afraid to follow my policy. When it is necessary to oppose these Washington newspapers, oppose them.

Now, let me show you the mandate that the Washington Times gave all of us last Saturday with reference to this bill. Here are excerpts from what the Washington Times, in its editorial last Saturday, said to us Members of Congress:

The extension of this important District thoroughfare has the endorsement of Secretary Weeks, all high officials of the War Department and Army, and of all citizens' associations in that section of the District. In a letter to Congressman STUART F. REED, chairman of the House District Committee, Commissioner Rudolph, chairman of the board of District Commissioners, states that "There is no District legislation now pending that is of more vital importance to the development of the northern part of the District than this bill" and also to the adjacent communities in the State of Maryland which are being developed so rapidly.

The permanent highway plan recognized Fourteenth Street as the rapid transit or street-car line adjacent to Sixteenth Street and diverted Fourteenth Street west one square to the line of Fifteenth Street at a point one square north of the present Fourteenth Street car barn, so that the car line on Fourteenth Street would furnish the general public of Washington with street-car transportation to the upper half of Rock Creek Park.

During the ensuing 10 years the 1½ miles has been completely built up with moderate-priced brick houses of a good type and small apartments. This development has extended to Fifteenth Street on the west and as far east as Georgia Avenue. The improvement of this section has furnished homes to more families during a 12-year building period than has the development of any other section of the city during an equal period.

Thus, this distinguished editor of the Washington Times has uppermost in his mind the development of the northern part of the District and the adjacent communities in Maryland.

Is it a question of the best interests of the Walter Reed Hospital boys or a question of the development of the northern part of the District and of Maryland? I do not blame our colleagues from Maryland for wanting this bill to pass. I do not blame them at all. It is natural. It is natural that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL] should be for it because the Times says it is to develop a part of Maryland.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I am not interested in that section because it is a wet or a dry section. As a matter of fact, it is a dry section.

Mr. BLANTON. And the dry section is extending northward, and a little later on the gentleman will find it will get drier and drier in and around even the city of Baltimore.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I want to say to the gentleman that this part has been getting wetter and wetter.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, this is after all mainly a question of recognition. You can have two bills of equal privilege, you know, and the Speaker can recognize the chairman whose bill he deems of the most importance, and the one he deems most urgent. It is a question of recognition here for us to decide. Which is most important, protecting Walter Reed Hospital, or developing northern Washington? I know it is important to the northern part of the District to develop it and grant new car service. I do not decry that at all. The Times editorial and this bill are highly important to the building up of the northern part of the District, and I know it is important to certain parts of Maryland in order to develop them. I do not deny that. The bill is important for those purposes, but the question is whether those purposes are of more importance than taking care of the poor, sick, and crippled men who are in the hospital on their beds—suffering. They are the ones I have in mind.

Shall we give their interests recognition first, and take care of them in preference to all of these subdivisions that have been put on out here along Alaska Avenue? Shall we think more of the able-bodied individuals who are occupying those fine new residences along Alaska Avenue in northern Washington and southern Maryland, or shall we think first of these suffering boys in the various wards of Walter Reed Hospital, many of them sometimes suffering torture? I am for giving recognition to them and taking care of those boys, and for subjecting this entire bill to their interests.

Here is the administration building [indicating on map]. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL], who has been a patient out there, tells us it is just about a block or two from there to the Georgia Avenue car line. That is not far for them to go, just a block or two. And he tells you that Thirteenth Street, if extended, would split this brick administration building wide open. If that is the case, then the Fourteenth Street double street-car line would be only a block

away to the west of the main administration building, and it cuts off all of these wards here [indicating]. It runs along all of these wards here [indicating] and the wards close by. Our distinguished colleague from Washington, Doctor SUMMERS, gives it as his medical opinion that it will injure these boys from a medical standpoint as to their health and also be a dangerous menace to them when they are afflicted with mental diseases.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Will the gentleman estimate about how many city blocks it is from Fourteenth Street to Georgia Avenue?

Mr. BLANTON. From here [indicating on map]?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. It is probably three and a half or four blocks.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Would not the gentleman think it was a little more than that?

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL] says it is a block or two from here [indicating the administration building] to Georgia Avenue and this administration building is on Thirteenth Street, which is only a block from Fourteenth Street [indicating], the gentleman himself would fix it at two and a half or three blocks, but I estimate it is about four blocks.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. It is a pretty long distance.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. But let me tell you this: You can go around these grounds if you want to with your double-track car line. This Georgia Avenue street-car line, as all of you know, runs down to Florida Avenue there by the baseball park. It connects with every car line in this District at U Street and Florida Avenue. It has a street-car connection where you can get transfers to almost every car line in the city. Let me call your attention to this fact. Why can they not extend this Georgia Avenue street-car line in different directions out into Maryland and take care of your Maryland people in that vicinity, who are sought to be taken care of by this bill?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does the gentleman recall that the proposed extension of Fourteenth Street will pass right through that portion of the grounds in which are the buildings now housing men suffering from mental diseases?

Mr. BLANTON. There is no sort of question about that.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. From mental diseases?

Mr. BLANTON. That is the case. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HERSEY. I want to know, on account of what you have said, if you have ever been there?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I have been there numerous times.

Mr. HERSEY. I live right by the side of Walter Reed Hospital, and the proposed Fourteenth Street car line will not interfere with the mental patients or any other patients there.

Mr. BLANTON. It will run right by this ward?

Mr. HERSEY. That is not a ward. That is where they teach them industrial work. There are no sick patients there at all.

Mr. BLANTON. Does not the gentleman know that these wards here [indicating on map] are the wards that are used for the disabled officers?

Mr. LINEBERGER. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LINEBERGER. The gentleman says it is used for that purpose now, but this is for all time and we have a wonderful location out there and we may want to use those buildings some day for an entirely different purpose.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to say to the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. HERSEY], because he usually has splendid judgment, that I am surprised now at his position. I follow him many times, especially on prohibition. Outside of our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL], I do not know of another ex-service man or an American Legion man who is in favor of this bill, not one. If the members of the committee know of any I wish they would give us their names. I do not know of one who appeared before the committee and asked that this street-car line be put in there.

Mr. HERSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. HERSEY. Speaking about those buildings that look like wards there now, the development of Walter Reed is to be in accordance with a special plan, and those buildings will come out of there when that development takes place.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, maybe so, but when that occurs, and they do not any longer have need of the hospital grounds, then it is plenty of time to open Fourteenth Street through those grounds with car lines.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I regret I have not time. Congress will still be in session, and there will be bills brought here again on the floor, and the Times will give us instructions as to what it wants passed, and we will act on their instructions and pass another bill some time. We can probably do that then; but I want to say this to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] that the gentleman ought not to move to strike out the enacting clause of this bill, because the gentleman will do injury to the real necessities of Walter Reed Hospital. If he has the interests of the Walter Reed Hospital boys most at heart, the gentleman will not move to strike out the enacting clause but will do this: On page 2, in line 1, if we will strike out the first three words, "except Fourteenth Street," and if we will then strike out all of section 3, we will then close up all streets and alleys in the grounds and maintain those hospital grounds in the way that Congress intended they should be maintained when they were first procured. That is what ought to be done with this bill, and there will be such an amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE] to strike out those three words at the top of page 2, and then to strike out all of section 3. That is what I tried to get the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ZIHLMAN] to agree to do this morning. If the gentleman will agree to that, he will not find many, I believe, who will vote against this bill. That much of the bill ought to be passed in order to close up all streets and alleys now in these hospital grounds, and I hope no one will move to strike out the enacting clause, but that we will adopt the McKenzie amendments to thus perfect the bill and have the hospital grounds there maintained permanently for the benefit of our injured service men.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Your suggestion is to strike out section 3 entirely.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; and strike out the first three words at the top of page 2. May I say this to the gentleman from Illinois? I do not believe there is any man here who has studied this bill closer than he has. Does he not believe that will reach what ought to be done in connection with this bill?

Mr. MCKENZIE. I will say to the gentleman from Texas it will satisfy me on the main proposition in the bill and will keep Fourteenth Street closed, and the other legislation to enable them to go around these grounds is something that ought to be brought in in another bill, in my judgment.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I would like to raise this question as to striking out the enacting clause. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this bill has passed the Senate, and if we simply amend it, we will send it to conference.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman need not be afraid about that. If there is any change in the House plan the House would have a chance to act on it under our rules.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman stated a while ago that no veteran had appeared in favor of this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. If any have appeared other than the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL], I do not know of it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Do you know of any who appeared against the bill at the general hearing?

Mr. BLANTON. None at all. Whether they knew of it or not, I do not know.

Mr. LINTHICUM. It was published in the papers and everybody knew of it.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. I merely want to ask the gentleman how much of a hearing the committee had on this bill anyway?

Mr. BLANTON. I think the committee reported this bill out on the strength of past hearings. If they had one on this bill, I do not know of it. If there is a single—I want to repeat this because it is important—if there is a single ex-service man from Walter Reed Hospital, outside of our one colleague here, who has declared himself in favor of this bill, please tell me who he is. I yield to any man in the House to tell me that. Since no one accepts the challenge, I will proceed. I do not believe these boys out there know anything about this bill.

I do believe that they would not agree to it if they did. I think they ought to be consulted. I think the opinion of Surgeon General Ireland against this bill should have more force and weight here, and the opinion of our distinguished colleague, Mr. SUMMERS, an eminent physician, who said it would be detrimental to the boys to have a double-track railroad run through there, ought to have more weight than the desires of realtors to develop. I think we ought to give more weight to their opinions and suggestions than we should give to that of the Secretary of War.

Mr. HERSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. HERSEY. I want to say that, of my own knowledge, I know these hospital boys are for the extension of Fourteenth Street.

Mr. BLANTON. Has the gentleman consulted them?

Mr. HERSEY. I have been at all the meetings.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is referring to citizens' meetings. When did the gentleman consult them?

Mr. HERSEY. They were present at our meetings. I do not think the gentleman can find a single soldier boy who is against it.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, they did not appear before the committee reporting this bill. On prohibition questions I would follow the gentleman from Maine from here to New Zealand, because he is absolutely sound on prohibition; but I can not follow him on this question. Now, in conclusion let me say again that I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] will not carry out his intention to move to strike out the enacting clause. Let us properly frame this bill, adopt the amendments that I have suggested, and we will have a good bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I should be glad to save in the bill what is good, but when you work the Fourteenth Street extension problem out we have got to draft a plan to turn to the left when you reach the hospital grounds, go north, and circumnavigate the hospital grounds; that is a matter of engineering, a matter of some difficulty, and I do not think it is the sort of thing that the House can properly do in a discussion under the five-minute rule.

Mr. BLANTON. You could do it this way, to strike out, as I have suggested, the words at the top of page 2, "except Fourteenth Street," and then strike out all of section 3. That would do exactly what the gentleman from Massachusetts wants done. You thereby close up the streets and alleys in the hospital grounds that are now open and which should be closed. There should be ample hospital grounds for these boys who are sick, and then we will not have to fight this question over again. I doubt if you will be able to get another bill out of committee, and you have got to get it out before you can pass it. We have this bill now on the floor, and we have a right to pass it, and we can frame it just as we want it by adopting the amendments that I have suggested.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I would like to have the gentleman have one minute more in order to ask him a question.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Illinois now has all the time left.

Mr. MCKENZIE. I yield to the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I want to say to the gentleman from Texas that it is not necessary to have legislation to go around Walter Reed Hospital. If the suggestion of the gentleman from Texas goes through, probably the District Commissioners and those interested will see to it that there is a method of getting around the hospital grounds instead of persisting in their efforts to go through.

Mr. BLANTON. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Undoubtedly the hospital sooner or later will have to be abandoned, but we do not need to abandon it now.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. And it will have to be abandoned if it is cut up.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Sure.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That in order to provide for the necessary extensions and additional buildings to be erected at the Walter Reed General Hospital, in the District of Columbia, all public streets, except Fourteenth Street, and alleys included within the area bounded by Sixteenth Street on the west, Alaska Avenue on the northwest,

Fern Street on the north, Georgia Avenue on the east, and Aspen Street, as platted on the official survey map, on the south, be, and the same hereby are, vacated, abandoned, and closed, the portions of public streets within said area which are hereby abandoned and closed by this act being known as Thirteenth Street, Fifteenth Street, Dahlia Street, Dogwood Street, and Elder Street.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, to strike out on page 2, in line 1, the words "except Fourteenth Street."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 1, strike out the words "except Fourteenth Street."

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion, to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. Can the gentleman from Massachusetts take the gentleman from Illinois off his feet after he has been recognized?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] has yielded.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I think almost every Member of the House now in the Chamber has exactly the same purpose as mine in dealing with this legislation. The question is as to the method to be pursued in order to reach our objective. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] moves to amend by striking out the words "except Fourteenth Street" in line 1, page 2. The effect of his amendment would be to leave the remainder of the bill so far as applicable before the House for further consideration. I have moved, deliberately and after reflection, to strike out the enacting clause, for this reason: I think there ought to be an outlet to the north somewhere between Sixteenth Street and Georgia Avenue. I think that northern region ought, for the general welfare of the District, to be opened up; there ought to be at least one more through artery to points north, northeast, and northwest. On the other hand, to work out that plan will probably involve a further examination of the whole project. It will perhaps involve an inquiry as to whether it is practicable to go north on Fourteenth Street extended to the south line of the Walter Reed Hospital, then turn west and then north and northeast along the hospital reservation. My own notion is that some plan like that is the best way out for the general welfare, including the welfare of the hospital patients. Or possibly a subway under the hospital grounds may be found feasible.

To determine the best method will require engineering and investigation. The investigation hitherto made by engineers of the War Department has been on the theory that we would bisect the hospital grounds. My guess as to the temper of this committee is that it will not authorize that. We want to evolve something else, but we can not do it on the floor of the House to-day. The best alternative must be worked out by engineers and surveys in order to achieve the most practicable plan possible.

Therefore it seems to me that the wisest and the fairest method of achieving our result is to strike out the enacting clause immediately and let the Committee on the District of Columbia a little later bring in a plan that will achieve the results we all agree are appropriate.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. As I understand, and I would like to be corrected if it is not correct, that portion of Fourteenth Street above the middle line running across is already open, is it not?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There is a kind of street there, but it looks more like a dump than a street.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I would like to ask the gentleman if the whole thing could not be solved by tunneling with an appropriate service station in the Walter Reed grounds to serve the Walter Reed people—to tunnel under the southern portion of Fourteenth Street? Would there be any objection to that?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think that might well be a desirable solution and the best solution, but you and I can not decide that here to-day. It involves a question we have not before us; it involves a question that, so far as we know, has not been considered by the expert advisers of the Government. Furthermore, section 1 involves the closing of certain other streets with the exception of Fourteenth Street. It is at least possible—I am not able to make a positive assertion—that if we deny the opening of Fourteenth Street there may be some readjustment necessary as to the other streets contemplated in section 1. In other words, gentlemen, to open Fourteenth Street is the purpose of the bill before us. It is part of a general scheme, and everything hangs upon what we do about Fourteenth Street. If we eliminate the extension of

Fourteenth Street, there is really nothing left of the bill. Therefore we ought to recommit it to the Committee on the District of Columbia and give that committee a chance to submit the proposition to us de novo.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. UNDERHILL. To oppose the amendment to strike out the enacting clause. Mr. Chairman, I have refrained from taking part in this discussion up to the present time, because at the last session of Congress I opposed the Fourteenth Street extension on certain definite grounds, and this bill met many or most of the objections which I raised at that time, consequently it would not look well for me to look up further objections to the bill. I object strenuously to striking out the enacting clause for the following reasons: If you adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois, you will really accomplish something constructive. It is my opinion that no legislation is necessary to go around the Walter Reed Hospital grounds. That can be done. You do accomplish, however, the closing of several streets now in the Walter Reed grounds which are unnecessary when some other means are provided to reach the city from that section of the outskirts of the city. Now, if you close those streets, if you show that Congress has some constructive idea on this problem, you will find that the commissioners and others interested are going to find a solution of it, and they are going to go around the hospital grounds. You are going to close up and make one reservation for the hospital patients for a few years, and then later on, maybe 5, 10, or 15 years, you are going to abandon the hospital in the interests of the growth of the city.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERHILL. I do.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If I may state this: If the motion to strike out the enacting clause carries, I had hoped and expected the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, when he went into the House, to move that the bill be recommitted to the District of Columbia. Now, when it goes back to the District of Columbia Committee, that committee will be able to make at their leisure, with expert assistants probably, the needed program.

Mr. UNDERHILL. The gentleman does not know the District Committee. If you expect to refer this back to the District Committee and get anything out this session, you are mightily mistaken. This has passed the Senate. At the most it will go to conference. I have no doubt as to the outcome of that conference, and that the will of the House will be considered by the conferees. If you send it back to the committee, you can not possibly take action on it this session, and we will lose just that much time; we will lose all the efforts put in by the committee, and also lose what has been unheard of in the committee, at least this session, and that is the practically unanimous report on a bill without a fight.

Mr. BLANTON. Is not the parliamentary situation this, that if the committee here adopts the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts and strikes out the enacting clause, that sends it back to the House, and the question before the House is whether or not we will strike out the enacting clause? There will not be a motion to recommit.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is in event the motion for the previous question is moved and passed, and I propose to give the gentleman from Maryland so far as I am concerned an opportunity to get the bill back to the committee.

Mr. BLANTON. But the proponents of this bill who want these streets opened up will not give that opportunity, but they will force the striking out of the enacting clause and these streets ought to be closed up.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I can not yield further. It has become almost a habit in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to strike out the enacting clause of every bill the District of Columbia Committee reports. It is a wrong method. If the District of Columbia Committee is unable to handle a situation—if it brings in a report it ought to be the moral duty, if it is not the real duty, of the Members of the House to offer some constructive legislation giving the District the benefit of their great wisdom.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERHILL. I will.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. From a reading of the hearings everyone seems to be agreed that these streets should be closed, and certainly we are accomplishing something constructive and helpful to Walter Reed Hospital by closing those streets.

Mr. UNDERHILL. That is what I am pleading for.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERHILL. I will.

Mr. TILSON. What serious objection is there to the plan suggested by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL] of making a covered passageway through these grounds? Now, to have to go around all those grounds for all time to come for all those people who live north, it is a long time to look forward to.

Mr. UNDERHILL. My friend from Connecticut need not be alarmed. They will go around for some time, but the growth of the city will require the removal of the hospital ultimately.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion of this matter of opening a street through the hospital grounds, and I am surprised at the tenacity with which some gentlemen who are in favor of the measure are persisting in their advocacy of it at this time.

There are many ways of killing a measure and there are many ways of getting it by; and while I would not for a minute charge the gentleman from Massachusetts with using a subtle method of keeping this matter before the attention of a committee which seems inclined to want to put this street through, yet I would bring to your attention the fact that now before the committee there is an opportunity to settle for a long time the question of cutting up and cutting through this hospital reservation, and that suggestion has been made by a number of gentlemen, including the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] and others who are anxious to settle for all time the status of this reservation.

If we knock out the enacting clause at this particular time, the bill goes back and again becomes a plaything for those who are dreaming of real-estate development and speculation beyond the hospital reservation.

Now, there is no question but that those who have this real-estate development and speculation in mind will find some way to get around this reservation, and I think we, as the custodians of the people's property at this time, when we have an opportunity to do something constructive, if it is necessary to do something of that kind in Committee of the Whole, should take such action as will forever close all these streets and take the entire matter away from the committee, so that the question will be settled, and those who want to speculate in the northwest will know that this matter can not be juggled in the future.

Now is the time to settle it. I hope this committee will settle it. I do not think we should strike out the enacting clause. We should act on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] which seeks to do something constructive, whereas the motion to strike out the enacting clause means to make it the plaything hereafter and perhaps give to the real estate speculators the opportunity to do things that ought not to be done. If those who are trying to get away with this should succeed, it will not be long before they might want to run streets through Arlington and through the Soldiers' Home grounds.

I believe in development, and I like to see things that are constructive take place; but here is a subtle proposition to put it back into committee again. I hope the motion to strike out the enacting clause will be defeated and that the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] to strike out the three words will be adopted.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to withdraw the motion to strike out the enacting clause, if it is capable of the construction that has been suggested.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to withdraw his motion to strike out the enacting clause. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, section 1 of this bill provides for the closing of all the streets to Walter Reed grounds except Fourteenth Street. The amendment which I have offered will close Fourteenth Street also. That is what we want to do. That will be an affirmative declaration of this House of the policy that we desire to pursue so far as Walter Reed is concerned.

Another thing: The Senate has gone on record as favoring the opening of Fourteenth Street through Walter Reed Hospital grounds. If the House adopts this amendment it will be at least notice to the Senate that the House does not approve of such a proposition. Then, of course, they will not agree to the amendment, and the bill will undoubtedly go to conference, and if the Senate persists in desiring to open Fourteenth Street through the hospital grounds we will meet them at that trench, and this bill will be as dead as if we struck out the enacting clause; but we will have the credit at least of trying to do something constructive.

I want to say that if this amendment is adopted we will follow it with others to strike out sections 2 and 3, and thereby accomplish the purpose in mind of protecting Walter Reed Hospital. [Applause.]

Mr. HERSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HERSEY. Mr. Chairman, I think there is some misunderstanding in the House. The committee reported this bill favorably; they were unanimous in their decision. I fear that there are men in this House who are listening to objections that are not well founded. Two years ago there was a hearing had upon this question of opening Fourteenth Street. I think those are the only hearings that were printed. Objections were then made to the extension of Fourteenth Street until Walter Reed and the surrounding neighborhood had been canvassed somewhat in relation to it.

Here is a map before you which represents the situation upon the ground at the present time. There are a lot of temporary buildings to be soon taken down. Since two years ago Walter Reed has had an architect and a landscape architect—two architects—to make a plan of the grounds and adapt this to the extension of the Fourteenth Street car line. The Fourteenth Street car line, when completed through, will not interfere with any of the new buildings to be erected there. All of them will be taken down. There are a lot of buildings there that are not in the way of the Fourteenth Street car line at all.

The Ninth Street car line is on Georgia Avenue and runs to a certain part of the city, while the Fourteenth Street car line runs to another section of the city.

Now, I live over near here [indicating on map], and I know what is going on in that neighborhood. I belong to one of the communities there that holds its meetings once a month, and right near the hospital there is another community. Those communities have met with the Walter Reed Hospital management, and they have discussed this fully with the Walter Reed management. The soldiers have attended those meetings, and we know them all, because we are well acquainted with the soldiers and visit them. This is my neighborhood here [indicating], and the people there are as much interested in Walter Reed, its beauty, and everything else, for its care and benefit, as any Member of this House who does not know anything about it. [Applause.]

I want to say that this is perfectly agreeable to the people of this community and to the Walter Reed Hospital management, and the Walter Reed Hospital management have made their plans accordingly. There is no objection from a single soldier who lives there to the Fourteenth Street car line going through the reservation.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERSEY. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Where, in the general scheme of things, is the neighborhood in which the gentleman is interested?

Mr. HERSEY. My neighborhood is over here [indicating], and there is another neighborhood.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman uses the Georgia Avenue car line?

Mr. HERSEY. I use the Georgia Avenue car line, of course, because there is no Fourteenth Street car line.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman will not deny that if the Fourteenth Street car line is put through, it will cut the Walter Reed Hospital reservation in two?

Mr. HERSEY. Well, look at it, gentlemen. Here is the Walter Reed Hospital reservation from there to there [indicating on map]. There are 75 acres in the Walter Reed Hospital reservation, and where it is proposed to be cut through there will not be a building nearer than this big building over here [indicating], with these temporary buildings out of the way. All of the Walter Reed Hospital development lies in this section here [indicating].

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERSEY. Yes.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Where is the medical school that is to cost \$750,000? Where is that located?

Mr. HERSEY. There it is [indicating]. That building is not yet constructed.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERSEY. There is one more thing I want to say before I conclude. This extension of Fourteenth Street and Alaska Avenue have no car line. There is a large settlement of people here [indicating] and it will be further developed. Those people can not possibly reach a car line at all without going across to Georgia Avenue, which is distant almost eight blocks.

Mr. KNUTSON. But they have a bus line running on Sixteenth Street.

Mr. HERSEY. But a bus line does not take the place of a car line.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I certainly hope the committee will not adopt this amendment without putting some provision in the bill which will give to the vast territory north of the Walter Reed Hospital reservation ingress and egress, if it is necessary to circumvent this hospital ground.

Now, there has been a very bad case of nerves developed about a street-car line going through this hospital reservation. The same gentlemen who are opposing the extension of Fourteenth Street objected to what was originally a medical center, an idea of the General Staff of the Army, and have never called attention to the fact that the wounded and disabled soldiers were placed on the Georgia Avenue car line. It was the idea to put a medical center at the other end of Sixteenth Street, with the White House at this end and the medical center, with a museum and library, at the other end. The original plan, as presented by the Surgeon General's office, did not provide for hospital wards between Fourteenth Street and Sixteenth Street, but provided for a medical center. Here is a map showing that, drawn in the office of the Surgeon General of the Army.

I want to say that during the months of the war and for a period after the war the patients at the Walter Reed Hospital were put on a car line. Where did they put the patients of Walter Reed Hospital? Did they put them on the Sixteenth Street end of the reservation among these quiet oaks that have been spoken of this morning? No. They put the patients of Walter Reed Hospital during the war and during some years following the war on the Georgia Avenue end of the reservation.

They originally made plans to provide for a medical center on the Sixteenth Street end and made plans which provided that Fourteenth Street should be extended through this reservation. Then afterwards, when they conceived the idea of this recreation center, they spoke of it as a medical center when they came here for appropriations, but when they come here opposing legislation which will develop that section of the District and of Maryland they call it the Walter Reed Hospital grounds.

Originally, it was not intended that Fourteenth Street should be closed, but that was one more street they were going to allow to go through in order to develop that section of the District.

Now, I feel, gentlemen of the committee, that if you are going to adopt this amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE], which will have the result of closing Fourteenth Street, there ought to be some language in the bill that would provide for the carrying of this street around the hospital grounds.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman permit a question right on that statement?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. Would the distances be unreasonable if that section in there were boulevarded so that it went around the hospital? Would that be unfair to the people living above?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I would say that I think the people who have bought property and bought homes north of the hospital, under the impression that Fourteenth Street, which is already opened to-day more than halfway through the hospital grounds, was going to be opened, are entitled to that thoroughfare; but if you are not going to give them that, you certainly ought to provide in that same bill some method by which the hospital grounds can be circumvented.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman think it requires legislation to do that?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I certainly think it does.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman indicate how that can be done?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts made a very fair statement on that point and he has said that it is an engineering and a technical proposition. It is rather difficult to frame parliamentary or legislative language that will carry out that purpose, but some one who has sufficient technical knowledge ought to offer an amendment to the next section of the bill providing that that thoroughfare can be carried around the reservation.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I yield.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Does the gentleman believe there is anything that would prevent the commissioners from granting a franchise or a right of way on Sixteenth Street by Walter Reed Hospital, provided we pass this bill with the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I certainly do. It is the adopted policy of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia not to allow any car line on Sixteenth Street, and this car line would have to be either on the western boundary of the reservation or on the eastern boundary of Rock Creek Park across Sixteenth Street, if it is not extended on Fourteenth Street, and there will have to be legislation providing for tunneling Sixteenth Street.

Mr. STEPHENS. Would it not be possible to take some ground off of the west side of the hospital property for the car line along Sixteenth Street and Alaska Avenue?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ZIHLMAN) there were—ayes 97, noes 10.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That under and in accordance with the provisions of subchapter 1 of chapter 15 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to institute in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia a proceeding in rem to condemn the land that may be necessary for the extension and widening of Fourteenth Street from Montague Street to the southern boundary of the Walter Reed General Hospital grounds, Nicholson Street from Thirteenth Street to Sixteenth Street, Colorado Avenue from Montague Street to Thirteenth Street, Concord Avenue from Sixteenth Street to its western terminus west of Eighth Street west, Thirteenth Street from Nicholson Street to Piney Branch Road, and Piney Branch Road from Thirteenth Street to Butternut Street, all in accordance with the plan of the permanent system of highways for the District of Columbia, and Piney Branch Road to a width of not exceeding 60 feet between Butternut Street and Blair Road northwest: *Provided, however,* That of the amount found to be due and awarded by the jury in said proceedings as damages for, and in respect of, the land to be condemned for said extensions or widening, plus the cost and expenses of the proceedings hereunder, four-tenths shall be assessed against the property which the jury shall find to be benefited.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. ZIHLMAN: Page 3, line 9, after the word "benefited," strike out the period, insert a comma, and the following language: "and the District Commissioners are hereby authorized to extend Fourteenth Street from the southern boundary of the Walter Reed Hospital to the western boundary thereof and thence to Alaska Avenue."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the paragraph or to the bill itself. The Chair will note that the primary purpose of the bill is to extend Fourteenth Street directly north through the Walter Reed Hospital grounds. There was no intention on the part of the committee to change the course of Fourteenth Street at the southern boundary and have it run west to Sixteenth Street and then north along Sixteenth Street to Alaska Avenue and along Alaska Avenue, that being the intention now of the Zihlman amendment. It is entirely foreign to the purpose of the bill and is in no particular germane to the purpose of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair inquire of the gentleman from Texas what extension and widening of Fourteenth Street is contemplated in section 2?

Mr. BLANTON. The Chair understands that Fourteenth Street as it was originally laid out would go through Walter Reed Hospital and continue on its northerly course, and the

purpose of the Zihlman amendment is to have Fourteenth Street when it reaches the southern boundary of Walter Reed Hospital not to continue in its course but turn west along the southern boundary of the Walter Reed Hospital grounds to Sixteenth Street and then up Sixteenth Street north and then along Alaska Avenue northeast. There is nothing in this bill that contemplated any such program as that. That is wholly foreign to the purposes of the bill.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I think just one word will satisfy the Chair. On page 2, lines 17, 18, and 19, Fourteenth Street is specifically mentioned. I submit to the Chair that the germaneness has nothing to do with whether Fourteenth Street runs north for six blocks or runs north for four blocks and then west for one block and north for one block. The germaneness has nothing to do with the direction. It is dealing with the street, and even Fourteenth Street is specifically mentioned. Therefore the amendment must be germane to the paragraph as well as to the bill.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will indulge me, I call the attention of the Chair to the title of the bill which is a bill providing for the extension and widening of Fourteenth Street, and I call the attention of the Chair also to the fact that the bill provides for the opening of the street fully half a mile south of the Walter Reed Hospital Reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. It seems clear to the Chair that the amendment is germane to the provisions of the section and the Chair will overrule the point of order.

Mr. ZIHLMAN and Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts rose.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Maryland a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland is entitled to recognition on his amendment if he desires it.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the committee to the fact that this bill was not primarily intended, as the gentleman from Texas said, to provide for the opening of Fourteenth Street through the Walter Reed Hospital Reservation. It provides for the closing of all the streets through the reservation that are marked in blue and it provides for the opening of those streets, some of them, half a mile south of the reservation. Therefore, if it is the intention of this committee to close Fourteenth Street along with Thirteenth Street and Twelfth Street, and the other streets running from east to west, there should be authority given to the District Commissioners to provide for passing around the hospital reservation and up Alaska Avenue to the territory to the north, and all I want to do is to give that authority to the District Commissioners.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is there anything in section 2, as it appears in the printed bill, which is concerned with the invasion of the Walter Reed Hospital territory? In other words, does section 2 in any respect require modification as a result of the committee action just taken on section 1?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I do not quite understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I want to ask the gentleman whether in view of the action just taken by the Committee of the Whole, as to section 1, any modification is required of section 2 in the printed text.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. No; I do not think so.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not a fact that section 2 deals with the acquisition of property south of and altogether outside of the Walter Reed reservation?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Therefore the gentleman would say, under the action taken by the committee as to section 1, that section 2 can stand without modification?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I should say so.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. As it now stands it will carry out the will of the committee?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes. The reason why I offered it to section 2 is that section 3 may be stricken out, and I would not have any opportunity to offer it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I do not know whether the members understand the purport of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ZIHLMAN]. Here is what the gentleman from Maryland proposes to do. There is an unopened strip between the present terminus of the Fourteenth Street car line and the

southern boundary of Walter Reed Hospital that is not now open with car lines.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Oh, that is a full mile from the present car line to the Walter Reed grounds.

Mr. BLANTON. That is about what I was going to state. As a matter of fact, it is not a mile, as I understand it, but about a thousand feet.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. No; it is more than that; it is about 7,000 feet.

Mr. BLANTON. Whatever it is, section 2 of the bill, so far as opening up that territory is concerned, is a good section. Just carrying that out will render a great benefit instead of doing harm. I have no objection to it at all. As a matter of fact, it really ought to be passed. But here is what the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland does: After you open that up and get to the southern boundary line of the hospital he proposes that you change the course of Fourteenth Street; that instead of its going north he wants it to go west along the southern boundary line of the hospital reservation and then up along Sixteenth Street to Alaska Avenue, and so on.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Would that carry with it the right of the street car line to run their cars along there and up Alaska Avenue and Sixteenth Street?

Mr. BLANTON. If the District commissioners approved of it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It would take affirmative action.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; not by Congress, but by the commissioners. There may come a time when we will no longer need the hospital grounds. Of course, I am talking about the future—in the course of years. Then, with the Zihlman amendment adopted, you would have a crooked Fourteenth Street with car lines running west to Sixteenth Street, and then north, when then it would be a good deal better to go straight ahead. I do not know that the commissioners of the District want that done. I do not know that the commissioners of the District want street car lines running that close to Sixteenth Street. It would spoil Sixteenth Street for a thoroughfare. It has been understood all along that Sixteenth Street is never to have a car line on it. I should regret to see a double-track car line along that splendid thoroughfare that runs out to the country to the north. The District commissioners may find another preferable way to get through. By leaving section 2 as it is in the bill, with whatever changes it takes to make it conform to the McKenzie amendment, the commissioners have the right to frame that proposition in a way that will meet the program of the city with reference to streets and parks. I hope we will not adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland to thus twist Fourteenth Street around so many angles.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ZIHLMAN]. I do not think the House really understands what that would do. I have been trying to figure it out in my own mind. It is a dangerous amendment, it seems to me, to adopt without investigation. You have perfected the bill in such a way that it is a good bill. It should be passed in the present form. I hope you will not ruin the bill by putting something on it that may destroy the merits of the bill. In my opinion there is a way, which the gentleman from Illinois has suggested, to get the street-car system out where they want it without hurting the Walter Reed Hospital grounds. I am inclined to think that the gentleman's amendment, if it was carried into effect, will hurt, if not destroy, the Walter Reed grounds. I hope it will not carry.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I move a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland, to strike out section 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman that that is not a proper substitute.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to debate his amendment? The gentleman can debate it if he desires.

Mr. MCKENZIE. I will wait until the gentleman from Massachusetts offers his substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute by Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts for the amendment offered by Mr. ZIHLMAN: Page 3, line 9, after the word "benefited," insert "the District commissioners are hereby authorized to run a street west from Fourteenth Street along the southern boundary of the Walter Reed Hospital Reservation to the southwest corner."

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment is simply to give an outlet to Fourteenth Street when extended to the south line of the hospital land. I think it does not do anything very different from that proposed to be accomplished by the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland. The only objection to the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland is that it calls an east to west street Fourteenth Street when it ought not, and it calls the street Fourteenth Street even when it runs north and northeast along the line of Sixteenth Street and Alaska Avenue.

It seems to me that what we want to accomplish is to get an outlet to the west from Fourteenth Street extended so that there will not be a dead end at the southern point of the Walter Reed Hospital grounds where Fourteenth Street strikes the hospital line.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Would the Walter Reed Hospital be expected to furnish the land on which this street is situated?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Not at all. The amendment would allow the street to be run along the southern boundary of the Walter Reed Hospital. I think it would be a good thing from the standpoint of the hospital as well as of the public to have that street so extended. We ought to encourage a car-line service for the soldiers and the employees of the hospital as well as for those who live north of this locality.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Are not there streets south of Walter Reed Hospital over that line they could run on? Surely, there are several from the end of the line at the present time to the Walter Reed Hospital. It is over a mile.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think there are no streets near by now, but, of course, they can be cut. My theory, however, is that it is a good thing for the Walter Reed Hospital reservation to be flanked by a street and ultimately by a car line along its southern boundary line.

Mr. HERSEY. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. HERSEY. The amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] striking out section 2 would strike out the authorization for the opening of a great many other streets that ought to be opened different from Fourteenth Street.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I see no reason why section 2 should be stricken out. The gentleman from Illinois and myself are in the most complete accord as to the objective sought by his earlier amendment. It seems to me that the retention of section 2 is absolutely in line with the action that the committee has taken in connection with the amendment to section 1.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will.

Mr. BEGG. Is the gentleman sure that if Fourteenth Street is continued out to the hospital grounds and these property holders this side of the hospital grounds want to donate land for a street, is the gentleman sure that the city commissioners would need authorization from Congress to put that street through?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Maryland, who is well versed in these matters, says that it would. I have no personal information or opinion.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Surely.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman knows that daily almost there are allotments laid out in this city and new streets located. Now, I have not been here very long, but in five years I do not recall our passing on any location of streets.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I do not think there can be any harm in giving that authority, even assuming that the authority already exists.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, the only time I care to take of the committee is this. It seems to me rather foolish for this House, in committee this afternoon, with no maps, no engineers' reports, nor anything to try to run a street from Fourteenth Street to Sixteenth Street. Now, it seems to me, if it is not contrary to the general plan of the city already adopted, the city commissioners can establish a street any place they want to if the property holders owning the property are willing to donate the property for street purposes, and if I am correct in that contention it seems to me we are absolutely working in the dark. I think both amendments ought to be defeated, so far as I am concerned, and both paragraphs ought to be kept in there in order to continue to keep the street up to where it now stops at the end of the hospital line.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. If the gentleman will yield, as a matter of law the commissioners have that right now. If the amendment offered is changed, would it not be construed

to mean that it conveys the right to the commissioners to pass over a sufficient portion of the southern boundary line of the Walter Reed Hospital to get out Sixteenth Street.

Mr. BEGG. I think if we put this amendment on we are authorizing the commissioners to condemn private and Government property—

Mr. HERSEY. The commissioners can not open a street without the consent of Congress.

Mr. BEGG. I rather think the gentleman is in error.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Maryland is right.

Mr. BEGG. I think the gentleman from Texas is in error. I have been here five years and there was never a single time vacated streets in the northwest part of Washington where there have been thousands of houses built. I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], who claims to know more about the District, as far as its needs are concerned—

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no.

Mr. BEGG. If we ever vacated any streets beyond Wisconsin Avenue within the past year, or any other streets?

Mr. BLANTON. No. In regard to new additions the commissioners already have authority; but in regard to the old established streets, like Fourteenth Street, we have authority.

Mr. BEGG. If the property holders want to donate a new street from Fourteenth to Sixteenth Street to the city, we do not need to have an act; the commissioners have authority.

Mr. BLANTON. But the gentleman does not want a dead end.

Mr. BEGG. If the property holders want it, I want it; but it does not make any difference to me. I would rather have a dead end than an open end wrongly placed by a crowd of men in the Hall of Congress without any maps or any engineering report.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, if this section is to remain in the bill—and it seems to be the consensus of opinion that it would be better to leave it in than to strike it out—I think the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts should be adopted, at least to show the feeling of Congress with regard to this matter. Now, if we go ahead and simply order Fourteenth Street opened up to the hospital grounds, to the southern boundary of the hospital grounds, the dead end, as it has been called, then the argument will be, and it can be made with a great deal of force, that Congress, having done this and provided for no outlet, then it must be we must go through the grounds. Now, my thought about it is this, that the street-car company in constructing a street-car line and going under Sixteenth Street and then paralleling Sixteenth Street and back to this avenue we spoke of this morning in the earlier part of this debate, it would not run up to the hospital grounds flush, but they would probably angle for some considerable distance away from the grounds and reach this depression under Sixteenth Street. Then they would go up along on the land of the park and come under Sixteenth Street and go on. But if we are going to leave this section 2 in, I think as a matter of declaration on the part of Congress, emphasizing the fact that we do not want them to go through Sixteenth Street, to say that we want them to have a right to go out to Sixteenth Street, is a good argument.

Mr. BEGG. Instead of stopping all the other street openings that are not objected to, why not strike out that part relating to the opening and condemning of the Fourteenth Street extension?

Mr. McKENZIE. I think I will offer that as an amendment or substitute.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be a mistake to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS]. His own statement made to the House a few minutes ago in support of his motion to strike out the preamble, in my judgment, shows that it would be unwise to adopt his amendment. The House will recall that he then felt this bill should be sent back to the committee in order that it might consult with the District engineer and provide how Fourteenth Street could be extended so as to connect with Sixteenth without passing over any part of the grounds of the Walter Reed Hospital. Now, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] is adopted this whole matter will be thrown into conference and the conferees will be authorized to go carefully over the matter with the District engineer, so as to intelligently recommend how the different street extensions referred to in section 2 of the bill can be best accomplished.

The House by striking out in the first section the words "except Fourteenth Street" has now voted to close all streets in so far as they intrude on the hospital grounds. The conferees then will be clothed with full authority to make

recommendations relative to the extension of these streets, subject to two limitations on which the House has just expressed itself, namely, that no street must enter on or cross over any part of the hospital grounds and that no street-car line shall be located on or along Sixteenth Street. Subject to these limitations, the conferees are quite free to reach some agreement looking to an extension of the streets so that a connection can be had with Sixteenth Street.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, let us have a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is called for.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 28, noes 23.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ZIHLMAN] as amended.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama demands a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 34, noes 17.

So the amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in line 8 of page 2, after the word "Street," the words "Fourteenth Street."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to return to the first section for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McKENZIE: Page 2, line 8, after the word "Street," insert the words "Fourteenth Street."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending, to strike out the section.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I want to offer a perfecting amendment. On line 14 of page 2 strike out the second word "and," and on line 15 of page 2 strike out the word "directed."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHINDBLOM: Page 2, line 14, after the word "authorized," strike out the words "and directed."

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, it may well be, in view of the changes that have been made in the bill or that will be made if the House approves the action of the committee, and particularly in view of the last amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ZIHLMAN], as amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS], that the Commissioners of the District may not find it conformable to the best interests of the District to proceed with the condemnation of land for all of these streets just as it is provided in the bill. For that reason I think it ought to be left optional with them as to whether they will proceed or not.

Mr. BLANTON. I think the gentleman is eminently correct. We ought not to direct them. They ought to have discretion.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. By using these words "and directed" we compel them to act, even against their own best judgment. They have the positive orders of Congress to proceed and condemn these streets. I hope the amendment will prevail.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made on this bill.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, in view of the situation I withdraw my motion to strike out section 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to withdraw his motion to strike out section 2. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 3. That when Fourteenth Street shall be opened for traffic to the south boundary of the property known as the Walter Reed Gen-

eral Hospital grounds, numbered for purposes of assessment and taxation as parcel 89 sub 7, the control and jurisdiction of that part of Fourteenth Street as laid down on the plan of the permanent system of highways of the District of Columbia which lies within the said hospital grounds shall immediately pass to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the same in all respects as other streets and avenues in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That the grade of the street through the hospital grounds shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of War.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out section 3.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 4. That an amount sufficient to pay the necessary costs and expenses of the condemnation proceedings taken pursuant hereto and for the payment of the amounts awarded as damages is hereby authorized, payable out of the revenues of the District of Columbia; the amounts collected as benefits to be covered into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the numeral "4" and insert the numeral "3," section 3 having been stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ZIHLMAN: Page 3, line 23, strike out the figure "4" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "3."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is under the impression that he did not put the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Texas. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] asks unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks he made on this bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SANDERS of Indiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 114) to vacate certain streets and alleys within the area known as the Walter Reed General Hospital, District of Columbia; and to authorize the extension and widening of Fourteenth Street from Montague Street to its southern terminus south of Dahlia Street, Nicholson Street from Thirteenth Street to Sixteenth Street, Colorado Avenue from Montague Street to Thirteenth Street, Concord Avenue from Sixteenth Street to its western terminus west of Eighth Street west, Thirteenth Street from Nicholson to Piney Branch Road, and Piney Branch Road from Thirteenth Street to Butternut Street, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is now on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the title will be amended to conform with the bill as amended.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a similar House bill will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

On motion of Mr. BLANTON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

IMMIGRATION BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the immigration bill for printing under the rules.

The Clerk read the title of the bill as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7995) to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States, and for other purposes.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE, AND FOR THE JUDICIARY, AND FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE AND LABOR

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. R. 8350, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. R. 8350, disagree to all Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is that satisfactory to the minority?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; I have already consulted with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], who is the ranking minority member.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Chair appoints the following conferees: Mr. SHREVE, Mr. TINKHAM, and Mr. OLIVER of Alabama

REVENUE BILL

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the revenue bill, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the revenue bill, disagree to all Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Chair appoints the following conferees: Mr. GREEN of Iowa, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. TREADWAY, Mr. GARNER of Texas, and Mr. COLLIER.

THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the American Bar Association has rendered an invaluable public service in stimulating during the past 12 months a study of the Federal Constitution, and the practical results accomplished are such as to justify an earnest hope that the work so splendidly begun will be continued.

Early in the fall of 1923 practically all of the national civic organizations devoted a week to the study of our fundamental law in accordance with a program carefully prepared by the American Bar Association. Later, through its influence, a group of great newspapers arranged a nation-wide contest between high-school students from every section. This contest resulted in many thousands of addresses dealing with the Constitution of the United States being carefully prepared and delivered by the youth of our country before assembled audiences which, in the course of the various stages of the contest, are estimated to have exceeded 12,000,000.

In my home State of Alabama the Age-Herald, one of the leading newspapers of the South, published at Birmingham, devoted great publicity and fine inspirational effort to making the contest a success. I was so impressed with the importance and far-reaching results of this contest sponsored by the newspapers that I wrote to Hon. F. I. Thompson, editor of the Age-Herald, for a copy of the first-prize oration awarded to Mr. Jack Turner, a 16-year-old student of the John Herbert Phillips High School, of Birmingham, who was one of the final seven national contestants. Mr. Thompson, in his reply, well states the purpose of this contest, which I take the liberty of here quoting:

In promoting this contest the Age-Herald was moved by at least a dual consideration. In the first place, the purpose was to bring the meaning of the Constitution emphatically to the attention of the people in such a manner as to impress them with its fundamental significance to the American Nation. In the second place, in the midst of criticisms of our constitutional establishments, including the indispensable functions of the Supreme Court and at a time when radical and bizarre influences are unduly aggressive, the Age-Herald was convinced that the Constitution itself and its wise and comprehensive provisions form the most complete, forcible, and irrefutable arguments in its favor.

Nowhere is there to be found more genuine reverence for our institutions nor more sincere love of country than among the young men and young women on the very threshold of life, with their ideals yet unspoiled and with their minds still plastic to receive these indelible impressions that shall color their ideas and opinions throughout life. Nowhere else is there to be found that enthusiasm which bridges all chasms and leaps

all sophistry. Nowhere else would it be possible to find a more disinterested support of the document on which our Government is founded. From no other source would the citizenship more cordially receive and approve the well-deserved eulogies of the Constitution which the young women prepared and delivered in such unselfish purpose.

The Age-Herald regards it as a distinction and high privilege of public service to have acted as sponsor in Alabama for this contest. The Constitution is based on the tried and tested principles of fairness, liberty, and justice which the centuries have proved to be eternal and irreplaceable. A study of this document of the ages is the most deadly blow that can be struck at the specious and spurious doctrines that are now current. The contest, it is hoped, is not the end, but the beginning of a more intensive understanding of the American Constitution, the corner stone of our form of Government, which is already the object of the admiring regard of the whole world.

The following is a copy of the very splendid and interesting oration by Mr. Turner:

"When the doors of Independence Hall were thrown open, September 17, 1787, proclaiming the close of the Constitutional Convention, the world received not only a model Constitution but the answer to the question which had confronted students of political science since the dawn of history—the question of whether or not liberty and union could be successfully united. Every nation in every age has attempted in some measure to realize this golden ideal in government. Glorious Greece walked forth in the pride of her freedom, so intent on liberty that she forgot the need, the necessity, of union, and Greece perished. Mighty Rome fostered and exalted union for its strength and power, until she became a tyrant, and Rome fell.

"Then how did America find the solution to the problem over which the ancients labored through the ages? Why did America succeed? It was not that there arose a patriotic Moses, who led us out of the political wilderness, nor was it that we were blessed with some superminded philosopher who devised a perfect system for us to follow. The secret of the solution lies in the document which since its birth has been the classical model for hundreds of Republics—those fundamental laws, the American Constitution. It was the product of the reasoning of 50 of our statesmen, the greatest of the eighteenth century, and the fact that these men succeeded in establishing a Constitution which has solved the ancient problem is not proof or even suggestion that their work was accidental. The fact that this law has been our rule without change for a century and a half, which has seen more scientific advancement than all the time of man before them, does not tell us their work succeeded by chance.

"That convention, which was destined to draw up 'the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man,' was, as Jefferson said, 'an assembly of the demigods,' and the document which was formed through the intellectual reasoning and understanding employed by the writers does approach so near to perfection it would seem that Providence must have been their guide and inspiration. In the group there were representatives from all the walks of life. In thinking, however, they were philosophers, broad-minded and prophetic minded. In fact, they foresaw an immediate era of mechanical and scientific discovery. Knowing that changes in the Constitution would be necessary with such advancement, they determined to make this supreme law flexible and elastic, yet firm and durable. It is true that these men, no matter how wise, could not determine in detail the nature of the coming progress, but they had one constant, tangible element upon which they could base all of their articles—human nature. They knew, as we know, that human nature, with all its emotions, jealousies, weaknesses, and virtues, had been the same when the great pyramids were built as it was in their time. They knew also that it would continue to be fundamentally the same after those pyramids had crumbled to dust, and it was upon this basic understanding that they built their reasoning.

"It is not profitable to look into the past unless we are solving through the past problems of the future. Our question is whether or not the United States will continue to exist as the model Republic of freedom and justice and whether our Constitution will always serve as practically as it has served for a hundred and fifty years. As we look back we are inspired with a feeling of confidence. We think of how these supreme laws were born in the minds of our pioneer statesmen in that age that 'tried men's souls.' We recall how their patriotic desires lacked the urge of personal profit. We think of how those 13 States which were held loosely together by that rope of sand, the Articles of Confederation, became firmly united by the American Constitution. We remember how a national spirit

sprung up, which has grown with a religious fervor throughout the years, and then we recall how this document which was our guide through the uncertain time of birth again suffered severe strain fourscore and seven years later. But we remember also how it survived this the most terrible of civil wars and how those States were brought back together under the same flag, the same President, and under that same Constitution. They reunited to form the most prosperous Nation on earth. Soon they held the world's balance of power, and when the dark clouds of war hovered over the entire world in 1914, when Mars threatened to wipe out all humanity, the United States of America intervened and the world was made 'safe for democracy.'

"As we look back into the strains and storms our Constitution has stood, from the strife that existed in the beginning through the gash made by Civil War and even through the experience undergone in the recent holocaust of 'deliberate scientific destruction,' we have a right to believe, if it is properly understood and judiciously interpreted, it will carry us and our prosperity on forever. But there is one recurring question left to us and our descendants. We know, as the framers knew, that 'new occasions teach new duties' and that constitutional modifications will be necessary in order to progress with science and civilization. If there were such a thing as science and civilization standing still, we could leave our Constitution as it is, and we would continue to exist forever as we do to-day. But that is impossible.

"This generation and the generations to come will have the problem of making such amendments as their respective modern ages may require. There is one rule for us to follow. The preamble of the Constitution must be our guide. We must bear in mind that there are certain fundamental laws which embody man's inalienable rights. Our forefathers recognized that these rights had been given man by Almighty God and that their duty was only to shield and guard them. They recognized, as the preamble bears witness, that the personal liberties guaranteed to every citizen must not only be preserved but must be protected. If you and I would lay claim to these guaranties of the Constitution, we should first of all make sure that we have fully complied with the recognized duties of American citizenship. Having measured up to this standard, if we will exercise an attitude of alert vigilance, if we will constantly watch the legislative movements of our Government, if we will always remember the momentous significance of the preamble, then 'that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.'"

The following excellent article on "Representative government" by Hon. John B. Knox, a distinguished citizen and lawyer of Alabama, and president of the Constitutional Convention of Alabama of 1901, will prove of interest and help to students of the Constitution:

I

In establishing this Government our fathers steered away from the direct and discredited democracies of Greece and Rome and established here under a written Constitution a representative Republic, which Mr. Gladstone in truth declares was the finest piece of government making ever struck off by any set of men in a given time.

It furnishes the one successful attempt at government of the people, by the people, and for the people, in the history of the world.

It has succeeded not as in Greece and Rome, by assembling the people en masse to try cases and pass laws, but by dividing the Government into three coordinate branches, the executive, legislative, and judicial, each separate and independent of the other, and each equal in dignity and in power. More than this, it is one Government as to national affairs and foreign relations, and many separate governments as it affects the local and domestic interests of the people. Unsettle this balance, make one branch of the Government subordinate to another, and you overthrow your Constitution and plant seeds for the destruction of your Government and the loss of your liberties.

And mark you, each in its respective capacity is appointed by and is the servant and representative and under the control of the American people.

Now, if the people can appoint a good Executive they can appoint good legislators and a good judiciary. The fault, if fault there be, is not with the system, but with the people themselves.

II

Again, each department of this Government is a trustee to the people both for upholding and for administering its own jurisdiction—not upon Democrats nor upon Republicans, but upon Democrats and Republicans alike when an issue arises which involves the prerogative of the branch of the Government which he is intrusted to administer. The power to declare war, for instance, is invested by the Constitution in Congress, and Congress would render itself infamous should it allow

this power to be usurped by the Executive. On the other hand, the power of making treaties of peace, and other treaties, is invested in the President "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate," and each would be recreant to its duty and unfaithful to its trust should it fail to perform its proper function.

III

But please observe, the power of negotiating and making treaties of peace was not invested in the Executive alone. The Constitution provides that the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur." In this duty then the Senate exercises quasi executive functions. It is in a certain sense a coexecutive with the President.

Our fathers who rescued from the wilderness the magnificent domain we enjoy, who framed our Constitution and established this Government, it seems, did not altogether confide in the superlative wisdom and inspired altruism of either department of the Government, and hence the system of checks and balances and divided authority provided in the Constitution, the wisdom of which is every year becoming more apparent.

An examination, therefore, by the Senate of the terms of this treaty is not a presumption. In doing so it exercises not only a high prerogative but discharges a sacred obligation.

Again, by and with "the advice and consent" means more than mere consent. It means that the Senate shall be fully informed, shall be frankly consulted, and as in the case of a consulting physician exercise its independent judgment.

If the Executive refuses to extend to it the confidence to which it is entitled, the Senate may and should indefinitely withhold its consent until fully informed as contemplated in the Constitution.

IV

In the Long Parliament in England and in the States General in France the legislative branch beheaded the Chief Executive, usurped every function of government, and assumed absolute dominion with a result which should not, it would seem, invite emulation. But that you say was long ago; men are better now. And yet for the adoption of reconstruction measures growing out of the Civil War we find a partisan majority seeking to override and impeach the Executive merely because in the conscientious exercises of his executive prerogative he resisted a movement to place the heels of more than 4,000,000 slaves upon the necks of their former masters. The message in which President Johnson vetoed this inhuman reconstruction measure is well known, and is one of the ablest ever delivered by any President. He retained Mr. Lincoln's Cabinet and endeavored to carry out his policies as the diary of Gideon Welles, Secretary of the Navy in both Cabinets, will sufficiently show. But what is not so well known is that Mr. Charles Sumner, who led this movement, some years later confessed to Senator Henderson, of Missouri, who with six others went against his party and successfully resisted these impeachment proceedings, that in that vote he, Henderson, was right, and he, Sumner, was wrong.

But if the dominance of the legislative branch is dangerous, the dominance of the executive branch is more dangerous, as witness our neighbor Republic of Mexico. Mr. Diaz, if I mistake not, commenced his administration under a constitution which precluded his being his own successor. With a well-organized machine and an army he persuaded the people to remove the restriction and continued in absolute power practically for life. Who is so dense as not to know that Central and South America present a constellation of republics with constitutions in form as good as ours, ruled by dictators, who call themselves Presidents, and where it requires an army and a revolution to change an administration.

Napoleon, too, was a man of the people—a man who defied liberty only to overthrow it—and whose beau ideal was not France, but the house of Bonaparte!

Idealism with some executives begins and ends with the I.

V

And finally, in this day of spirit rappings and world visions, of anarchy and radicalism, of the enshrining of every new fad and dogma simply because it is new, of the wasteful expenditure of billions of dollars of the people's money without any adequate check or commission therefor only to be ground from them later by oppressive taxes, what our country needs in religion and in statesmanship is a new baptism in orthodoxy and in conservatism.

My complaint is not against a political party. All government by the people must needs be party government. The country needs and must have two great parties, not sectional, but national, the one a check on the other, the principles and policies of which are openly stated and sincerely advocated before the bar of public opinion. Our danger is not in constitutional government, but in personal government backed by secret organizations, which multiply with remarkable rapidity, which are absorbing every branch of business activity, and last but not least has invaded and seized even the police power of

the Government, thereby menacing the whole country with a state of absolute lawlessness!

We have seen that political parties can be patriotic.

We have seen the Democratic Party as one man support Mr. McKinley in the Spanish-American War, and the Republican Party as one man support Mr. Wilson in the greatest war of all times.

It may be and the time may not be far distant when another coalition of every patriotic citizen without regard to past party affiliations may be demanded for the preservation of our property, of our liberty, and even of life itself:

In the meantime, let us, Democrat and Republican alike, go back to the Constitution, the aegis of our protection, the inherited Magna Charta of our liberty.

Let us make it and enshrine it as our statue of liberty. And with united voices let us say to all bolsheviki, to all open or secret conspiracies against law and order, as Lord Bulwer makes Richelieu to say:

"Around her form I draw
The awful circle of our solemn church;
Let but man place foot within that holy ground,
And on his head, yea though he wear a crown,
I launch the curse of Rome!"

REGULATION OF THE PRACTICE OF OPTOMETRY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 3236, a bill to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Maryland yield?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. There was a program agreed upon on bills which if followed would finish the Gilbert bill. We are about two-thirds through that bill, and we ought to finish it one way or another. We have exhausted all general debate on it. The bill has been read, and there was a motion to strike out the enacting clause, which failed, and it will take only a short time to finish it.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. UNDERHILL. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GILBERT] is not here, and it would be hardly fair to take up the bill in his absence.

Mr. BLANTON. I know he is necessarily detained, but, nevertheless, I think we ought to take up that bill.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that I understand there is going to be a great deal of opposition to that bill, and I hope to get through a few bills about which there is no controversy.

Mr. BLANTON. But there is opposition to the bill which the gentleman has called up.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana demands the regular order. The gentleman from Maryland moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 3236.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on this measure be dispensed with.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a question. It has been announced in the press that there is a great deal of very important legislation pending for the District. Is this the most important bill you have pending?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois the important bills to which he refers are matters of very deep-seated and widespread controversy, and I had hoped to take up these matters that were uncontested and dispose of them.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I am not going to object, Mr. Speaker, but there will be a request for an extra day, or two or three days, perhaps, to consider District matters, and we are evidently taking up less important legislation than they actually have pending.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. If the gentleman will ask that general debate be limited to 30 minutes to the side, I shall not object, but there is some very strong opposition to this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. To this eye-doctor bill?

Mr. BLANTON. This is the optometry bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We ought to finish that up with five minutes debate on a side and get rid of these spectacle peddlers.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, 20 minutes to the side.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I modify my request, and ask that general debate be confined to 40 minutes, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas and the other one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 40 minutes, one-half to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Texas. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 3236, with Mr. SANDERS of Indiana in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 3236, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my time. Will the gentleman from Texas please use some time?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the only objection I have to this bill is that it places absolute power in the board provided for in the bill, which could be controlled to the detriment of certain deserving parties interested in this business. There is entirely too much control lodged in such boards, affecting every kind and class of professional business in the District.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington and Mr. HILL of Maryland rose.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield first to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I would like to say very frankly to the gentleman that I hope we will not take a lot of time on this bill. Personally, I dislike to see the Government going into boards and commissions and arms of the Government itself, but cities regulate the spectacle peddler and he is now out of business. He has gone the way of the clock maker, and it is a crime to have them going around and robbing the people and ruining people's eyes, and therefore I am for this bill strong. That is all I need to say.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; and I am for such a bill strong if it is properly safeguarded, but would not place the absolute control in one particular little board that without an appeal could keep out all competition, if they wanted to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. They do not do that. If they had a city council here they would recommend this.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment. I want first to answer the gentleman from Washington. We must decide whether this bill safeguards all worthy practitioners. I can explain this to you by calling attention to an affidavit that I have along another line concerning a similar bill that will be brought in here soon with respect to the further restriction of securing licenses in the plumbing business in Washington.

I have an affidavit from an expert plumber who owns his residence here in Washington, which cost several thousand dollars, and he has been living in it for some time with his wife and little children. He has been an expert plumber for twenty-odd years, and because he moved to Washington and would not join in with a certain little clique that is controlling the licenses, they have refused to license him and have refused to let him work at his trade of plumbing, although he has been an expert plumber for twenty-odd years.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. He can make more money, probably, fixing up automobiles.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LAZARO. Has not your State a board of medical examiners to license physicians and a board to license druggists and a board to license nurses?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; and I am in favor of such proper boards.

Mr. LAZARO. Do you not think people's eyes are vital to them?

Mr. BLANTON. That is exactly what I was coming to. If we would open this question up and see that every interest connected with this particular profession and business was protected, I would be just as strongly in favor of this bill as any-

one; but we have not done that, and our committee has not done that. We ought to look into these matters and see just exactly who is behind such a board and see just exactly the kind of power they are going to manipulate here and see what control they are going to make of it, and see that the people are properly protected, and then I would be in favor of such a board. If this bill safeguards all such rights, then I am in favor of it.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Is there not some existing board to which this could be referred without the creation of another board?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; there is some regulation now, but they claim it has not sufficient powers and they want this bill passed to give them sufficient powers.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Is there any compensation provided for this board? I presume they will have secretaries and officers.

Mr. BLANTON. They will get all compensation from fees charged, but not from the Government.

I do not care to take up any more of the time of the committee. If we had opened up the hearings and given everybody a chance, it would be a different matter. We have another bill before us very much like this, and I have received protests against it from all over the country. There are two schools involved and one school is trying to take advantage of the other, and the one that is being taken advantage of by the bill has been protesting against its passage. Until we give both sides a hearing on that bill, we ought not to report it or try to pass it. We ought to see that everybody is properly protected. That is all I want to say on this bill. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman from Texas would use up his time.

Mr. BLANTON. Have the bill read under the five-minute rule; I am through.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That on and after six months from the passage of this act it shall be unlawful for any person in the District of Columbia to engage in the practice of optometry or to hold himself out as a practitioner of optometry, or attempt to determine by an examination of the eyes the kind of eyeglasses required by any person, or hold himself out as a licensed optometrist when not so licensed, or to represent himself as capable of examining the eyes of any person for the purpose of fitting glasses, excepting those hereinafter exempted, unless he shall have fulfilled the requirements and complied with the conditions of this act and shall have obtained a license from the District of Columbia Board of Optometry, created by this act; nor shall it be lawful for any person in the District of Columbia to represent that he is a lawful holder of a license as provided by this act when in fact he is not such lawful holder, or to impersonate any licensed practitioner of optometry, or shall fail to register the certificate as provided in section 13 of this act.

Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction for the first offense shall be fined not more than \$500, and upon conviction for any subsequent offense shall be fined not less than \$500 nor more than \$1,000, or be imprisoned in the District jail not less than three months nor more than one year, or both, in the discretion of the court.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment; that wherever the words "hold himself out" are used substitute "represents himself to be."

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I object to that and make a point of order against it. That raises an entirely different question than that presented by the bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TINCER). The point of order is overruled.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will accept that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Wherever in the bill the words "hold himself out" occurs, strike them out and insert "represents himself to be."

Mr. WINGO. Is that the correct language?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. If the gentleman can make better English of it, I am perfectly willing.

Mr. WINGO. Oh, I agree with the gentleman from Washington as to the desirability of the amendment. I am talking about the exact structure of the amendment. I ask the Clerk to read the language as it would read if the amendment is adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

That on and after six months from the passage of this act it will be unlawful for any person in the District of Columbia to engage in the practice of optometry or to represent himself to be a practitioner of optometry, etc.

Mr. WINGO. It should include the word "to." The amendment should be that wherever that language occurs in the text it shall be amended so that it will read "or represents himself to be." Then that will take care of both phrases.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I will modify my amendment, Mr. Chairman, in that respect.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington modified his amendment, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Three members of the board shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, and should a quorum not be present on the day appointed for any meeting those present may adjourn from day to day until a quorum be present.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The question has been asked me as to the Columbia Optometric Society: What kind of an organization is it, when was it organized, and how?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I can only say to the gentleman that it is an organization composed of the optometrists of the District of Columbia. I do not know how long it has been in existence. It is made up of the most reputable men in the profession.

Mr. WINGO. I do not know, but there is a difference between these specialists. This includes, I suppose, men like Edmonds, and all of that type of firms come under this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Nearly all the firms have an expert optometrist.

Mr. WINGO. This is a regular society, a proper organization, is it?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. I have no personal interest in it; but when Members asked me to develop it I told them I did not know, but I presumed it was composed of reputable men. I presumed it was composed of reputable men and was an actual bona fide organization. There is no question about that in the mind of the committee?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. No.

Mr. WINGO. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. That the secretary-treasurer shall receive as compensation for his services an annual salary to be determined by the board, which salary and all other expenses of the board necessary in carrying out the provisions of this act shall be paid from the funds in the custody of the secretary-treasurer for the use of the board upon requisition signed by the secretary-treasurer and countersigned by the president of the board; and on the 30th day of June of each year if any surplus remains the members of the board shall be paid such reasonable compensation out of the funds in the custody of the board as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may determine: *Provided, however,* That said compensation and expenses shall not exceed the amount received by the board under the provisions of this act.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, when a man is examined to practice law he pays a fee and gets his license. When he practices a certain number of years he is entitled to a license in the appellate courts and in the Supreme Court of the United States. He does not have to pay an annual license fee. He pays a fee for his first license. The license fee for the Supreme Court of the United States is only \$10. But you charge an initial license fee in this bill of \$25, and you make a fund here in this bill to pay not only the secretary-treasurer of the organization a salary but provide that whatever surplus is left over at the end of the year, after holding two meetings a year, the members of this board shall receive compensation within the limit of that surplus. That is paid out of the initial fee of \$25 that he has to cough up when he gets his license. It does not stop there, for after paying the \$25 he has to pay \$10 every year for the continuation of the license.

Mr. UNDERHILL. If the gentleman will yield, let me say that that is to keep a check on these people. It is not simply to provide a fund. You have to pay each year for the automobile license.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts think that there is any more reason for charging an original fee of \$25 to one of these professionals than there is for others?

When a lawyer pays \$10 for his license he is done and does not have to pay \$10 a year for each year thereafter.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I do not want to reflect on the legal profession or the value of their services.

Mr. BLANTON. A man could make a mistake and get the wrong kind of a lawyer and might have a million of dollars involved in a financial way that would become a loss, hence there is as much necessity of getting a good lawyer as there is of getting a good eye doctor.

Mr. UNDERHILL. If the gentleman will yield right there, let me say that if I had a million dollars I would rather lose it than to lose my eyesight.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; all of us would rather do that.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. WINGO. May I suggest also to the gentleman from Texas that whenever you license a lawyer he goes into court and other lawyers come in contact with his work, but you take one of these optometrists and all of his work is done privately. His fellow optometrists have not much of a way of checking him up unless some person should go over to another one of them, maybe, and he finds out what has been done. There is quite a distinction. Suppose there are 50 optometrists in this city, a large number I should think, they would only pay \$500 a year. I will tell you what I think will happen. I think you will find out that this fund will not be sufficient, and they will come in here and appeal to the liberality of our friend from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] next year for an appropriation to be paid out of the Public Treasury, and I think that would be proper.

Mr. BLANTON. I doubt whether they would ever get it through the present chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. The gentleman from Arkansas is speaking facetiously.

Mr. WINGO. I think his well-known liberality in these matters would justify me in saying they will.

Mr. STEPHENS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. STEPHENS. Would it not be just as much of an argument to make that a physician should pay every year?

Mr. BLANTON. Just as much. When he makes a mistake his error is covered up in the ground.

Mr. STEPHENS. But the argument would go just as far.

Mr. BLANTON. Just as far.

Mr. STEPHENS. Absolutely.

Mr. WOODRUFF. As a matter of fact, we have doctors and dentists who have to pay a fee now. They may not in the District of Columbia, perhaps.

Mr. BLANTON. They pay a practitioner's tax, not a license fee.

Mr. WOODRUFF. In the State of Michigan the dentists pay a fee of \$1.

Mr. BLANTON. That is a tax for the expense of the State examining board.

Mr. STEPHENS. Do they pay every year?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Every year.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. They have been asked if they did not think the fee was high, and they say with the limited number here they are willing to pay it.

Mr. BLANTON. In view of the fact that this is not going to come out of the Public Treasury I am not going to say anything more against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. That on and after six months from the passage of this act, as set forth in section 2 hereof, every person desiring to practice optometry, or, if now in practice, to continue the practice thereof, except as herein otherwise provided, shall take an examination as provided in this act and shall fulfill the other requirements as in this act provided.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for this reason: The members of this committee will note this is different from almost any other act we have passed, and from most of the acts of the States in reference to the practice of certain professions and callings because it requires those now legally engaged in the practice to take a limited examination.

Mr. UNDERHILL. If the gentleman will yield, I had the same opinion the gentleman has in regard to this bill until I looked at the next page, and I would like to ask the gentleman if he has read the proviso:

Provided, however, That failure to pass the standard examination after having qualified under the limited examination as in this paragraph set forth shall not disqualify him as a lawful practitioner.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I understand he must pass the limited examination or he will be disqualified. Now, I felt a little responsibility about this, because I drew the report made to the House on this bill, and I confess this phase of it had not been called to my attention at the time, but since then I have received a call from a gentleman who I asked to put his objections to the bill in writing, and this was one of the objections, with the suggestion that this made the bill, as he said, *ex post facto*, but what he meant was retroactive and to that extent unconstitutional. Now my own judgment about the matter is it does not make this bill unconstitutional but that this Congress has full power and authority to provide at least a limited examination of those who are to practice this profession in the District of Columbia, and that the limited examination which is specified here, which they may be required to take which will qualify them to practice irrespective of whether they can pass the other examination or not, is a very proper examination which any practitioner of optometry ought to be qualified to pass in order lawfully to practice on the people of the District. However, I felt this responsibility about it, and I felt I ought to call the attention of the committee to this fact that this provision is in here directing or requiring those in the practice should pass this limited examination.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out section 10.

The CHAIRMAN. Section 10 has not yet been read.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Then I move to strike out the sufficient number of words to obtain the floor. I would like to ask the attention of some of the legal talent in the House in regard to their interpretation of the law. I do not care from which side of the House it comes, but my experience with a similar bill in another body has led me to believe that such a provision as this would be declared unconstitutional or rather that this bill would be declared unconstitutional. Consequently it had better be stricken out as it would jeopardize the whole bill by leaving it in. The only question in my mind is whether the proviso on page 8, "That failure to pass the standard examination after have qualified under the limited examination as in this paragraph set out shall not disqualify him as a lawful practitioner," in other words a man who has been practicing optometry in this District for the past 5, 6, or 12 years or more under the provisions of this law unless he is able to pass this limited examination would be prohibited from practice. The courts would clearly hold in this instance that it was unconstitutional because it was retroactive.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has taken into consideration that although such a provision in a State law would probably be held unconstitutional, it would probably not be so in this case? Most of the State constitutions have such provisions as would prevent infringement upon the rights of those who had already entered upon certain lines of employment, but there is no such reservation in regard to the Federal District. I heard a former Senator from Mississippi, Mr. John Sharp Williams, make an able presentation of the subject in the Senate. He said we often overlook the fact that Congress has more ample powers over the Federal District than over the States. The powers of Congress under the Federal Constitution with regard to this Federal District are broader than the powers over the peoples of the several States and more ample than the powers of the States over their own people under the limitations of their constitutions. I believe that this provision in section 9 providing for a limited examination of those already in the practice of optometry is a wise provision and that it is constitutional.

Mr. WINGO. My attention has been directed to the provision referred to; and I think that even if this were a statute passed by a State legislature, the provision in the bill is plainly constitutional. I think you take care of that situation, and I think some of the gentlemen may have an idea that the courts have gone further on that question than they really have done. Here is the viewpoint they will ultimately come to in connection with people who are dealing with the public in a technical way: When you give them a reasonable opportunity to demonstrate that they are capable, and you provide them with a limited examination, such as is provided here, and then with a yearly examination, here is where you will get them if they are not capable and competent. The gentlemen who drew this bill evidently had this in mind. You give them a limited examination and then an annual examination, and a man has no vested right in either fraud or incompetency. If that is true, here is where they will weed out those who are not competent. We will say they may be occupying a position

in a reputable concern, or as an assistant to one who is competent. They will say, "We will let you stand on the limited examination." Then, if a man starts out for himself and can not measure up to the standards of a profession where he is holding himself out to his prospective customers, they would have a right to hold that he was not competent. You are refusing to give to him a certificate of competency. That is all you are doing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, may I have three minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINGO. He is asking for an annual certificate of competency in his profession, and no man has a right to receive a false certificate issued by a public board—a certificate of incompetency.

Mr. BEGG. The courts usually hold that a legislative body has the right to require certain standards in any profession. I think you will find that they have.

Mr. WINGO. Some gentlemen are fearful, I think, that the courts have gone further. I have not refreshed my memory recently as to that, but I think I am clear enough in my recollection to be led to believe that the language you have here will be sustained.

Mr. UNDERHILL. That is the common-sense view that I would take as a layman. However, I wanted legal and professional advice on the matter in order that the constitutionality of the law might not be questioned later on.

Mr. WINGO. Let me make this suggestion: Somewhere or other in the bill, as a new section, if it is not already in, insert a provision to the effect that if a part of the bill should be declared unconstitutional it shall not invalidate all of the bill.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 13. That every person desiring to be licensed as in this act provided shall file with the secretary-treasurer of the board upon appropriate blank to be furnished by said secretary-treasurer an application, accompanied by the recommendation of two reputable citizens, verified by oath, setting forth the facts which entitle the applicant to examination and license under the provisions of this act. The said board shall hold at least two examinations each year. In case of failure at any standard examination, the applicant, after the expiration of six months and within two years, shall have the privilege of taking a second examination by the board without the payment of an additional fee. In case of failure at the limited examination hereinbefore provided for, the applicant shall, after the expiration of six months and within two years, have the privilege of taking a second examination without the payment of an additional fee.

Every applicant who shall pass the standard examination or the limited examination, as the case may be, and who shall otherwise comply with the provisions of this act, shall receive from the said board under its seal a license entitling him to practice optometry in the District of Columbia, which license shall be duly registered in a record book to be properly kept by the secretary-treasurer of the board for that purpose, which shall be open to public inspection; and a duly certified copy of said record shall be recorded in the clerk's office of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, and shall be admitted as prima facie evidence in all courts of the District of Columbia in the trial of any cause, and it shall be the duty of the clerk of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia to keep a special book for the purpose of recording said licenses, and shall, upon application and by the payment of a fee of 50 cents, deliver to any person applying therefor a certificate that the license has been recorded in compliance with the provisions of this act. Each person to whom a certificate of license shall be issued by said board shall keep same displayed in a conspicuous place in his principal office or place of business wherein said person shall practice optometry, and shall, whenever required, exhibit the said certificate to any member or agent of the board.

The CHAIRMAN. On line 5 of page 10, at the beginning of the line, there should be a correction in the spelling of the word "purpose." Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, it is my recollection that there was some provision in this bill about turning the fees over to the use of the board instead of turning them into the Treasury.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. That is true.

Mr. CRAMTON. Where is that provision?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. The fees received are turned over to all boards of this character.

Mr. BLANTON. The fees are paid by the applicants.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not care by whom they are paid, but there ought not to be a provision here to make it a matter of personal interest to the board.

Mr. BLANTON. The fees are paid to the secretary. That is on page 8 or 9 or somewhere in the latter part of the bill.

Mr. UNDERHILL. It is at the bottom of page 5.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Certainly.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman was not here a little while ago when we had up that question. I suggested that at the outside there would not be over 40 or 50 of these applicants in the District. It would not be over \$500 a year. I suggested that it would not be long before it would be suggested that these fees be paid into the Treasury, and then they would ask that the board be paid. In due time we may expect this board to be paid out of the Treasury.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman at the head of the optometry association came to my office and said that the reason why they made the fees as high as they were was that they wanted to be self-supporting. On that ground I think we would not want that money to be paid into the Treasury.

Mr. CRAMTON. The policy is wrong of setting up a board and saying to that board, "You can go out and drag in here as many applicants as you can, and however ill prepared the applicants may be for the performance of the duties they undertake the more you get, the more fees you get, and the bigger salary your secretary gets."

Each one has a direct interest in encouraging applications, and there is only one way of encouraging applications and that is to lead people to believe they are going to be able to pass. It seems to me you weaken this proposition by making it directly to the financial interest of the officers themselves to encourage people that they are going to pass.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. This is the procedure followed not only here but in many of the States. I had something to do with the passage of a bill providing for a board of examiners on accountancy. I know that bill provided they should administer their own fees, and the bill providing for a dental board provided that they should administer their fees, and if there was any excess it should be paid into the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CRAMTON. I assume the committee would not want to consider an amendment, and as the section has been passed I do not see that anything can be done.

Mr. WINGO. Would the gentleman be in favor of striking it all out and providing for a straight appropriation?

Mr. CRAMTON. I am opposed absolutely to the principle.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I will state to the gentleman that in the State of Michigan the fees for the licensing of those who desire to engage in the practice of dentistry are collected by the State board of dental examiners, and the yearly fees so collected are used to pay the expenses of the State board of dental examiners. I believe that is the practice in several of the States.

Mr. CRAMTON. I agree that Michigan is a model in most things but I would not claim it is in everything. There must be a few exceptions.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 14. That the said board shall charge the following fees for examinations, registrations, and renewals of certificates: The sum of \$25 for a standard or a limited examination. Every registered optometrist who desires to continue the practice of optometry shall annually, on or before the 10th of January of each year, pay to the secretary-treasurer of the board a renewal registration fee to be fixed annually by the board, not to exceed \$10, for which he shall receive a renewal of his certificate. In case of neglect to pay the renewal fee as herein provided the board shall have authority to revoke such license and the holder thereof may be reinstated by complying with the conditions specified in this section, but no license or permit may be revoked without giving 60 days' notice to the delinquent, but the board shall only have the right to renew such license on the payment of the renewal fee with penalty of \$5: *Provided*, That retirement from practice for a period of not exceeding five years shall not deprive the holder of said license the right to renew the same upon the payment of the fee herein required.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the word "of" will be inserted after the word "license" in line 14, page 11.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 20. That the provisions of this act shall not apply—

(a) To physicians and surgeons practicing under authority or license issued under the laws of the District of Columbia for the practice of medicine and surgery.

(b) To persons selling spectacles and [or] eyeglasses and who do not attempt, either directly or indirectly, to adapt them to the eye, and who do not practice or profess the practice of optometry.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment: On page 13, strike out lines 14 to 17, inclusive.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BEGG: On page 13, strike out all of lines 14, 15, 16, and 17.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the attention of the committee, and it may be they can change my mind. I have offered an amendment to strike out lines 14 to 17, inclusive. If you can tell me how a man can sell me eyeglasses, even under a prescription, unless he is an optometrist, I would be glad to have that information.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Did the gentleman ever hear of any window glass being sold as eyeglass?

Mr. BEGG. I think my remarks are serious; at least, I think they are.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mine are serious, too.

Mr. BEGG. I do not think they are serious.

Mr. WINGO. I think both gentlemen agree, but have failed to observe what each other said.

Mr. BEGG. I am of the opinion—although I am not particularly interested, because I am not buying any glasses to-day—that with these lines in the bill every quack eyeglass man in town can continue to practice. What is the language?

That the provisions of this act shall not apply—

To persons selling spectacles and [or] eyeglasses and who do not attempt, either directly or indirectly, to adapt them to the eye.

Well, how can he sell a man eyeglasses? He will give them to him and let him try them on, and if a man says he can see out of them, he will take them.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. But motor glasses are eyeglasses, and sunglasses are eyeglasses. There are a great many forms of glasses sold besides specially prepared glasses.

Mr. BEGG. I understand that, but it seems to me the gentleman is killing the bill by these lines.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I do not think so.

Mr. BEGG. It makes it apply only to the man who practices, the eye doctor.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. This provision applies to persons selling spectacles and eyeglasses and who do not attempt to adapt them to the eye.

Mr. BEGG. If the gentleman will pardon me, if I have a store down here and do not attempt to adapt eyeglasses to the eye I can give a man a pair of eyeglasses and tell him to put them on, and if he says they suit him he can take them, and I can continue doing that right along. If I do that, I can not be touched under this provision, it seems to me.

Mr. UNDERHILL. That has not been the way it has been adjudicated in the States.

Mr. BEGG. Perhaps this particular provision has not been adjudicated. I submit to every man in the House that this language will let any man sell eyeglasses just so long as he refrains from saying the glasses do not fit or if he does not attempt to adapt them to the eye.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman thinks it would apply to a man who would say, "Here is a pair of eyeglasses; put them on and see whether you can read the letters 'Z,' 'E,' and 'X.'"

Mr. BEGG. There is no question about that in my mind.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. He would merely say, "See if you can read the letters 'Z,' 'E,' and 'X.'"

Mr. BEGG. Certainly; because the seller is not fitting him or attempting to adapt them to his eyes. All he does is to hand him a pair of glasses and tell him to put them on.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It seems to me that would be violating this law.

Mr. BEGG. No; he would not be violating this law, because the man himself is putting glasses on and determining himself whether they fit. I am not going to insist on my amendment. I merely offered it for the purpose of calling the atten-

tion of the committee to the fact that I believe this language simply undoes what the committee is trying to do.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. The men engaged in this business proposed this.

Mr. BEGG. I understand that; but I do not believe it is the right thing.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. And it is in every bill in every State.

Mr. WINGO. Do you not think you could possibly reach what both of you are thinking of by putting in a short amendment so that it will read:

To persons selling spectacles and eyeglasses, such as sunglasses, motor goggles, and other similar protective devices, who do not attempt, either directly or indirectly, to adapt them to the eye.

Do you not think that would cover it? The idea is to prohibit a man from going ahead and selling something that he pretends and represents as correcting a defect in the vision. That is the object, of course. The committee did not intend to have this apply to a man who would come along and sell you a pair of sunglasses or a pair of motor goggles to protect you against dust. The committee did not intend that such a man would have to be a licensed optometrist.

Mr. BEGG. Of course not.

Mr. UNDERHILL. You can send out to Chicago to any of the mail-order houses now and they will send you a gross of such glasses and there is no law in any State to prevent it.

Mr. WINGO. The reason I make that suggestion is because you have here the danger of leaving a loophole. One of my friends asked me what was in the bill and I said it was a long bill but a short title would be, "A bill to prevent grafters from selling window glass to negroes for spectacles." That is really what you are trying to get at. The average intelligent man will look into the capacity of a man before he attempts to purchase eyeglasses, but you have peddlers and crooks going around and taking money away from negroes and illiterate people and selling them nothing but plain window glasses for spectacles and charging them \$5 or \$10 for attempting to fit their eyes, and people of that kind ought to be protected against such grafters.

Mr. BEGG. They could do that very thing under the bill with this provision in it.

Mr. WINGO. That is why I suggested this change.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, after listening to the discussion the purpose of the champions of the bill is very apparent. It is the purpose of the bill as drawn, and that seems to be the purpose of the committee, to permit anyone to sell glasses, no matter how strong or how weak the lens may be, whether it is just plain window glass or very strong lens, and to sell them without being subject to this act so long as the person who does the selling does not pass upon the question of whether they are going to injure or help the person who wears them. In other words, no matter how much the glasses might ruin the sight of the person wearing them, there is no prohibition on their sale here, so long as it can not be proven that the man who makes the sale assumed to say they would be helpful to the eyes. As the gentleman from Arkansas has said, the peddling of window glass is not prevented at all by this language. It is wide open to sell glasses as worthless as can be conceived or as ruinous as can be conceived, as long as you can not prove in court that the person that made the sale made a fitting. It is all right, if that is the kind of bill you want.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I would defer somewhat to the special knowledge of the gentleman from Michigan ordinarily, but I am basing my position on the fact that this is the language used in similar laws in practically every State in the Union, including his own, and it does effectively prevent the faker from prescribing for a patient, and does not prevent the dealer in sunglasses or the dealer in goggles or spectacles from selling the gentleman from Michigan or myself a colored sunglass or an automobile protecting glass.

Mr. CRAMTON. When we pass a law with reference to the regulation of the practice of medicine, we forbid a man prescribing. We forbid his practicing medicine. We forbid his furnishing something to cure what is wrong with you.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no; if the gentleman will permit right there, we do not. A man in order to violate the ordinary run of laws—I will say the law of your State and mine—must take money for the remedy in order to come within the criminal prohibition of the act. In other words, we can regulate only the practice of some learned profession. We can not prohibit the sale—

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman does not mean that the test under this language is the question of whether a man is taking money for his alleged skill, because there is no

claim that these glasses are going to be given away, and whatever part is involved in the cost of the glasses, for the skill of fitting them, is not the question here.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; I am drawing the gentleman's attention to the fact that all we can do is to limit the practice of a learned profession or calling which requires some education and training. We are not attempting in any way to limit the sale of any sort of an article, and we have not any right to do that, and I speak because the gentleman said that a man may be licensed to practice medicine and not permitted to give any sort of thing as a remedy to a person.

Mr. CRAMTON. It just comes to my mind, since the law of Michigan has been cited here, that I recall opposing the enactment of an optometry law in my State when I was in the legislature because we were establishing entirely too many boards of this sort; but if you want to pass such a bill, I suppose it is a good thing to have it full of holes, so that it will not interfere too much with the course of nature.

Mr. UNDERHILL. The practice under the provisions of similar laws in the States was that a fakir set up in his store or on the street a chart and prescribed for the patient. The only knowledge that he had of optometry or of eye trouble was to place the chart at a certain distance, and if the patient said "I can read the bottom line" he told him the glasses were correct and sold them to him. That resulted in a great deal of harm, and people in some cases were made blind. Under this law any man who attempts to prescribe or who attempts to use a chart and then sells glasses to correct defective vision can be prosecuted.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Under this, as drawn, a man comes down the street with his case of glasses and sees the colored man that the gentleman from Arkansas speaks of and says, "You ought to be wearing glasses." He says, "I expect I should." That is all right. He says, "Here is a pair." And he puts them on and goes off. That may be destructive. He may have ruined the man's eyesight, but this bill does not reach him.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. Is it not true that anyone who cares at all for his eyes should go to a man competent to examine his eyes, and after he gets his prescription is it not true that he should go to a good optician?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Absolutely so.

Mr. LAZARO. Just as you go to a good doctor for a prescription, and then after you get your prescription you go to a good druggist to fill it.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I agree with the gentleman, and the bill seeks to assist the patient to find reputable persons.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 21. That wherever in this act the singular number is used it shall be interpreted as meaning either singular or plural if compatible with the sense of the language used; and when in this act the masculine gender is used it shall be construed as meaning also the feminine gender if not inconsistent with such use.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, after line 23, add a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 22. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such a provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ZIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SANDERS of Indiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3236) to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with amendments, with the recommendation

that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. ZIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any of the amendments? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ZIEHLMAN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ENROLLED HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL

Mr. ROSENBLOOM, from the Committee on Enrolled bills, reported that on May 10, 1924, they presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following House joint resolution:

H. J. Res. 195. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for the participation of the United States in two international conferences for the control of the traffic in habit-forming narcotic drugs.

INDEBTEDNESS OF THE KINGDOM OF HUNGARY

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8905, to authorize the settlement of the indebtedness of the Kingdom of Hungary to the United States of America.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. SANDERS of Indiana in the chair.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill will be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this bill is to fund the indebtedness owed the United States by the Kingdom of Hungary. This loan was not made under the provisions of law to lend money to our allies to aid in the prosecution of the war, but was loaned for humanitarian purposes. After the armistice there was a great deal of suffering in Hungary; babies and women were dying by the thousands and the United States Government authorized the Grain Corporation to sell foodstuffs to Hungary to save the lives of thousands of women and children. The amount advanced to Hungary totaled \$1,685,000.

Hungary, as you know, is in a very depleted condition and has never been able to meet any of the sum due us and has paid nothing on it and can not until this matter be funded. When the loan was made the United States and the other allied nations and friendly nations which furnished food to save life had a first lien on the assets of Hungary, which, of course, in the long run amounted to nothing but the obligation of Hungary to repay this indebtedness. Hungary's finances are still in a very depleted condition. She can not meet any of her obligations unless she can float a rehabilitation loan. This bill provides for funding the indebtedness of Hungary of \$1,600,000, and is exactly in terms with the settlement of the indebtedness of Great Britain and Finland with this one exception, the exception being that the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to cancel the first lien that the United States might have on the assets of Hungary, making it subject to the rehabilitation loan of \$50,000,000 which is to be floated, and the United States is not to do that unless all the other allied creditor nations who stand in the same position with the United States as to the first lien make the same cancellation.

England, Switzerland, France, Holland, and other allied countries advanced foodstuffs when we did, and they have in common with the United States a first lien on the resources of Hungary. This simply authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to waive the lien in favor of this rehabilitation loan of \$50,000,000, provided all the other nations which made advances for humanitarian purposes—the purchase of food to save human life—make the same waiver. If they do not waive it, the United States does not waive it. Now, the Congress of the United States did this identical thing so far as Austria was concerned. We advanced foodstuffs to Austria, and in March, 1922, Congress postponed that indebtedness 25 years and waived its first lien for the purpose of enabling Austria to float a rehabilitation loan. This does exactly the same thing. This funds the indebtedness of Hungary for 62 years, and the interest is calculated on the amount of the indebtedness at 4½ per

cent up to December 15, 1923. The same rate of interest was figured on the indebtedness of England and Finland. The total amount due at this time on this funding of principal and interest was \$1,900,000 and a few odd dollars, practically \$2,000,000.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. In a second I will be glad to yield to the gentleman. This funding is under the same terms as that of England and Finland. For the first 10 years the interest is 3 per cent. After that it is 3½ per cent. It is payable over a period of 62 years amortized and payable in gold, and the Government of the United States accords Hungary the right to settle the indebtedness by accepting at par any bonds of the United States of America that were issued after April, 1917, with the exception, as I have before stated, of making this loan subject to the lien of the rehabilitation loan of \$50,000,000. It is identical with the settlement made with England and Finland. This does not make the indebtedness of the United States subject to any reparation claims, but only for this rehabilitation loan. Now I will yield to my friend from North Carolina.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am not going to oppose the bill. I opposed the settlement of the British loan, but was in a small minority. The gentleman is still on that commission—

Mr. CRISP. I have the honor to be on that commission; yes, sir.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is the gentleman in a position to give the House any information about what is going to happen with the indebtedness of France to this Government, whether anything has been done or the purpose or what they are trying to do? It seems that is one of the largest nations that does not seem to have any regard for any of her obligations to this country as far as I can ascertain, and I want to know what the status is, if there is any.

Mr. CRISP. I think I can answer for the commission. The commission is doing everything that we can to try to bring about a funding and settlement of the indebtedness due this Nation, not only by France but by all the other creditor nations, and the commission is always very happy when it can present to the House a settlement and funding of any indebtedness, even of any of the small nations. The amount here involved compared with our foreign indebtedness is infinitesimal, less than two million, but we are glad to present it because we think that is notice to the other creditor nations that the United States expects them to settle their indebtedness, and we hope these matters will have a salutary effect on the other nations.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Are there any diplomatic reasons why we should not say to France that we expect her to settle what she owes to the United States?

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman from North Carolina will understand that I am a minority member of the commission, and also that our diplomatic correspondences with other nations of the world are conducted by the President of the United States, our Chief Executive, who is charged with that responsibility, but I know it is the desire of the commission and the Chief Executive to do all that they can to bring about the funding of our foreign indebtedness. We recognize, of course, it is impossible for these creditor nations owing colossal sums to pay in cash, and therefore we are anxious to fund and amortize their indebtedness, which we believe will insure its ultimate payment and tend to stabilize the world's economic condition. The Foreign Debt Commission, and I feel I am authorized to say the Chief Executive, are doing all they can to try to induce the debtor nations to settle with us.

Mr. KINDRED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. Yes.

Mr. KINDRED. Going back to the question of Hungary, the gentleman has spoken of the debt being about \$2,000,000. Does that refer to the whole balance now due?

Mr. CRISP. Yes. I will answer the question of the gentleman from New York. The total indebtedness of Hungary to the United States, arising from the sale of foodstuffs to sustain life, furnished through the Grain Corporation, amounted to \$1,685,835.61. The accrued interest on it up to the time of this funding of the indebtedness, calculated at 4½ per cent, the same as was done with Great Britain and Finland, brings the total principal to \$1,939,000.

Mr. KINDRED. It has been said that other debtor nations perhaps have not paid their interest. Has Hungary paid any interest at all?

Mr. CRISP. When this was funded they paid \$745 to reduce it, so that the bonds and obligations could be worked out in even dollars.

Now I do not care to take up any further time of the House. I do not think the agreement and the form of bonds used in this settlement, which is exactly the same form of bond as was used in the case of England and Finland, has ever been placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and it may be of convenience in the future to find the form of that agreement and the bond if placed in the RECORD. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including in the RECORD a copy of the report in which is contained a copy of the agreement made with Hungary, and a copy of the bond that is to be executed under the agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by inserting the report as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the report referred to:

[House of Representatives, Report No. 654, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session]

SETTLEMENT OF THE DEBT OF HUNGARY TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CRISP, from the Committee on Ways and Means, submitted the following report, to accompany H. R. 8905:

The Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8905) to authorize the settlement of the indebtedness of the Kingdom of Hungary to the United States of America, having had the same under consideration, unanimously report it back to the House without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The World War Foreign Debt Commission negotiated a settlement with the minister of Hungary at Washington, which was embodied in an agreement executed, with the approval of the President and subject to that of Congress, on April 25, 1924, pursuant to authority conferred by the act of Congress approved February 9, 1922, as amended by the act of Congress approved February 28, 1923.

The indebtedness, in the principal amount of \$1,685,835.61, was incurred in connection with food purchased on credit from the United States Grain Corporation for relief purposes, and is evidenced by one of a series of obligations of the Government of Hungary designated as "Relief Series C, of 1920," which, according to their express terms, are a first lien upon all the assets and revenues of Hungary.

The agreement, with the exception hereinafter referred to, follows in substance that made with the British and Finnish Governments, the basic date of the bonds to be issued being December 15, 1923. The principal sum of the debt, as of that date, is \$1,939,000 and is payable in annual installments, beginning with \$9,600 on December 15, 1924, and increasing with due regularity to \$75,000 on December 15, 1935. Any payment of principal may be deferred for not more than two years from its due date, but the payment falling due in the next succeeding year can not be postponed for more than one year from its due date, and the payment falling due in the second succeeding year can not be postponed at all until the payment due two years previous thereto shall have been made. Payments of principal may also be made before maturity on giving not less than 90 days' notice. Interest is payable on the unpaid balances semiannually at the rate of 3 per cent per annum to December 15, 1933, and at the rate of 3½ per cent per annum thereafter. One-half of the interest accruing between December 15, 1923, and December 15, 1928, may be funded into bonds with maturities similar to those of the original issue. All payments on account of principal or interest are to be made at the Treasury of the United States or at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York in United States gold coin of the present standard of value or in obligations of the United States issued after April 6, 1917.

The exception referred to appears in section 7 of the agreement, which provides that the bonds to be issued shall be secured in the same manner and to the same extent as the obligations of the Government of Hungary now held by the United States, and authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to release all or any part of such security for the purpose specified, provided that substantially all other creditor nations holding obligations of Hungary similarly secured release to a similar extent the security enjoyed by their respective obligations. No such question of security was involved in the settlements with the British and Finnish Governments.

The Government of Hungary is to-day in serious financial difficulties and it appears that a reconstruction loan is imperative in order to bring about a rehabilitation of its finances. In order to obtain this loan it is contemplated that the lien upon the assets and revenues of Hungary, enjoyed by the series of obligations of the Government of Hungary referred to, shall be subordinated to that of the reconstruction loan just as similar liens were subordinated to that of the reconstruction loan recently floated by the Government of Austria.

Section 7 of the agreement makes it possible for this Government to cooperate in this respect with other governments having similar claims against Hungary and to extend to the Government of Hungary terms of a similar nature to those already extended to the Government of Austria under authority conferred by joint resolution passed by Congress and approved by the President on April 6, 1922.

A copy of the letter written by the Secretary of the Treasury, chairman of the World War Foreign Debt Commission, to the President, submitting to him for his approval the agreement made by the World War Foreign Debt Commission with the Government of Hungary providing for the funding of its indebtedness, a copy of said agreement and the form of the bond to be executed are annexed hereto.

WORLD WAR FOREIGN DEBT COMMISSION,
Washington, April 25, 1924.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The World War Foreign Debt Commission, created under the act of Congress approved February 9, 1922, as amended by the act of Congress approved February 28, 1923, having received the representative appointed by the Government of the Kingdom of Hungary to consider the refunding of the indebtedness of that Government to the United States, reports as follows:

The Government of the Kingdom of Hungary designated as its representative Count Laszlo Szechenyi, its envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary at Washington, who advised the commission that he had been instructed by his Government to express its desire to refund its indebtedness to this country, provided that terms could be agreed upon with which it would be possible for it to comply. Frequent conferences resulted between representatives of the commission and the Hungarian minister at Washington, at which the minister emphasized particularly the fact that his Government is to-day in serious financial difficulties and that a reconstruction loan has become imperative in order to enable it to rehabilitate its finances.

After full consideration by the commission of the problems involved in refunding the indebtedness of the Government of Hungary to this country, the minister indicated that he would be willing to enter into an arrangement on behalf of his Government to refund the indebtedness in question on terms similar to those embodied in the agreement executed by the United States with the Government of Finland on May 1, 1923, the total amount of the indebtedness to be determined as of December 15, 1923, accrued interest to that date to be computed at the rate of 4½ per cent per annum, the repayment of the indebtedness so determined to be provided for by the issue at par as of that date of bonds in the principal amount of \$1,939,000, and the immediate payment in cash of any amount found to be due over and above that figure.

The minister pointed out, however, that the indebtedness of his Government to the United States is evidenced by one of a series of obligations designated as "Relief series C of 1920," the other obligations of this series being held by other creditor nations of Hungary; that this series of obligations, according to its express terms, is a first lien on all the assets and revenues of Hungary; and that the success of the reconstruction loan referred to is essential that the lien enjoyed by this series of obligations be subordinated to that of such loan. He accordingly made his consent to enter into the foregoing agreement contingent upon appropriate provision for the subordination of the lien enjoyed by the obligation of the Government of Hungary now held by the United States to that of the loan, suggesting that some such course of action be provided for as in the case of the relief obligation of the Government of Austria held by this Government, by embodying in the form of agreement and bond as executed by the Government of Finland two amendments worded substantially as follows:

To be inserted as section 7 of the agreement:

"Security: The payment of the principal and interest of all bonds issued or to be issued hereunder shall be secured in the same manner and to the same extent as the obligation of Hungary in the principal amount of \$1,685,835.61, described in the preamble to this agreement; that is to say, shall be 'a first charge upon all the assets and revenues of Hungary and shall have a priority over costs of reparation under the treaty of Trianon or under any treaty or agreement supplementary thereto, or under arrangements concluded between Hungary and the Allied and Associated Powers during the armistice signed on November 3, 1918': *Provided, however,* That all or any part of such security may be released by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States on such terms and conditions as he may deem necessary or appropriate in order that the United States may cooperate in any program whereby Hungary may be able to finance its immediate needs by the flotation of a loan for reconstruction purposes, if and when substantially all other creditor nations holding obligations of Hungary similar to that held by the United States and described in the preamble to this agreement, to wit, Denmark, France, Great Britain, Holland, Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland, shall release to a similar extent the security enjoyed by such obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury of the United States shall be authorized to decide when such action has been substantially taken."

To be inserted as the third paragraph of the bond:

"The payment of the principal and interest on this bond is secured in the same manner and to the same extent as the obli-

tion of Hungary in the principal amount of \$1,685,835.61 described in the preamble to said agreement, subject to release in whole or in part by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States under authority conferred by section 7 of said agreement."

You will note that the form of agreement as amended makes it clear that the bonds to be issued pursuant to its terms shall in the first instance have the same security as that now enjoyed by the obligation of the Government of Hungary held by the United States, but makes it possible for this Government to cooperate with other governments having claims against Hungary in the manner required in the pending program for the financial reconstruction of Hungary. The authority conferred upon the Secretary of the Treasury in the latter connection by the amendments agreed to is substantially the same as that conferred upon him with reference to the relief obligation of the Government of Austria held by the United States by the joint resolution passed by Congress and approved by the President on April 6, 1922.

Briefly, the agreement accords to the Government of Hungary, with respect to the repayment of its indebtedness to the United States, terms similar to those already extended to the Governments of Great Britain and Finland and, with respect to the security enjoyed by the indebtedness, terms of similar nature to those already extended to the Government of Austria.

On April 7, 1924, at a meeting of the commission, by appropriate resolution unanimously adopted, the Secretary of the Treasury, as chairman of the World War Foreign Debt Commission, with the approval of the President and subject to the approval of Congress, was authorized and directed to execute for the commission on behalf of the United States of America, under the terms of the act of Congress approved February 9, 1922, as amended by the act of Congress approved February 28, 1923, an agreement with the Government of Hungary providing for the refunding of its indebtedness to the United States upon terms substantially similar to those embodied in the agreement concluded by the United States with the Government of Finland on May 1, 1923, the form of agreement and bond as executed by the Government of Finland to be amended substantially as above indicated.

I have the honor to hand you herewith for your approval such agreement, executed in two counterparts pursuant to the foregoing resolution, together with one copy thereof for your files.

The commission believes that a settlement of the debt of the Government of Hungary to the United States on the basis specified is fair and just to both Governments and recommends for submission to Congress the terms embodied in the agreement herewith.

Should you see fit to indorse your approval on the two counterparts of the agreement herewith, I should appreciate it if they might be returned to me, in order that one copy may be transmitted to the Hungarian minister at Washington and the other to the Treasurer of the United States, to be held pending such action as Congress may take in the matter.

Respectfully submitted.

A. W. MELLON,
Secretary of the Treasury and
Chairman of the World War Foreign Debt Commission.
The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

AGREEMENT MADE THE 25TH DAY OF APRIL, 1924, AT THE CITY OF WASHINGTON, D. C., BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE KINGDOM OF HUNGARY, HEREINAFTER CALLED HUNGARY, PARTY OF THE FIRST PART, AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, HEREINAFTER CALLED THE UNITED STATES, PARTY OF THE SECOND PART

Whereas Hungary is indebted to the United States as of December 15, 1923, upon an obligation maturing January 1, 1925, in the principal amount of \$1,685,835.61, described as "Relief Series C of 1920," together with interest accrued and unpaid thereon; and

Whereas Hungary desires to fund said indebtedness to the United States, both principal and interest, through the issue of bonds to the United States, and the United States is prepared to accept bonds from Hungary upon the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth:

Now, therefore, in consideration of the premises and of the mutual covenants herein contained, it is agreed as follows:

1. Amount of indebtedness: The amount of the indebtedness to be funded, after allowing for cash payments made or to be made by Hungary, is \$1,939,000, which has been computed as follows:

Principal amount of the obligation to be funded.....	\$1,685,835.61
Interest accrued thereon from May 29, 1920, to Dec. 15, 1923, at the rate of 4½ per cent per annum.....	253,917.48
Total principal and interest, accrued and unpaid as of Dec. 15, 1923.....	1,939,753.04
To be paid in cash by Hungary April 25, 1924.....	753.04
Total indebtedness to be funded into bonds.....	1,939,000.00

2. Repayment of principal: In order to provide for the repayment of the indebtedness thus to be funded, Hungary will issue to the

United States at par, as of December 15, 1923, bonds of Hungary in the aggregate principal amount of \$1,939,000, dated December 15, 1923, and maturing serially on each December 15 in the succeeding years for 62 years, in the amounts and on the several dates fixed in the following schedule:

December 15—	
1924	\$9,600
1925	9,800
1926	10,000
1927	10,200
1928	10,400
1929	10,600
1930	11,000
1931	11,500
1932	12,000
1933	12,500
1934	13,000
1935	13,500
1936	14,000
1937	14,500
1938	15,000
1939	15,500
1940	16,000
1941	16,500
1942	17,000
1943	17,500
1944	18,000
1945	18,500
1946	19,000
1947	19,500
1948	20,000
1949	21,000
1950	22,000
1951	23,000
1952	24,000
1953	25,000
1954	26,000
1955	27,000
1956	28,000
1957	29,000
1958	30,000
1959	31,000
1960	32,000
1961	33,000
1962	34,000
1963	35,000
1964	36,000
1965	37,000
1966	38,000
1967	39,000
1968	40,000
1969	41,000
1970	42,000
1971	43,000
1972	44,000
1973	45,000
1974	46,000
1975	47,000
1976	48,000
1977	49,000
1978	50,000
1979	51,000
1980	52,000
1981	53,000
1982	54,000
1983	55,000
1984	56,000
1985	57,000
Total	1,939,000

Provided, however, That Hungary may at its option, upon not less than 90 days' advance notice to the United States, postpone any payment falling due as hereinabove provided to any subsequent June 15 or December 15 not more than two years distant from its due date, but only on condition that in case Hungary shall at any time exercise this option as to any payment of principal, the payment falling due in the next succeeding year can not be postponed to any date more than one year distant from the date when it becomes due unless and until the payment previously postponed shall actually have been made, and the payment falling due in the second succeeding year can not be postponed at all unless and until the payment of principal due two years previous thereto shall actually have been made.

All bonds issued or to be issued hereunder to the United States shall be payable to the Government of the United States of America, or order, shall be issued in such denominations as may be requested by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, and shall be substantially in the form set forth in the exhibit hereto annexed and marked "Exhibit A." The \$1,939,000 principal amount of bonds first to be issued hereunder shall be issued in 62 pieces, in denominations and with maturities corresponding to the annual payments of principal hereinabove set forth.

3. Payment of interest: All bonds issued or to be issued hereunder shall bear interest, payable semiannually on June 15 and December 15 in each year, at the rate of 3 per cent per annum from December 15, 1923, to December 15, 1933, and thereafter at the rate of 3½ per cent per annum until the principal thereof shall have been paid.

4. Method of payment: All bonds issued or to be issued hereunder shall be payable, as to both principal and interest, in United States gold coin of the present standard of value, or, at the option of

Hungary, upon not less than 30 days' advance notice to the United States, in any obligations of the United States issued after April 6, 1917, to be taken at par and accrued interest to the date of payment hereunder: *Provided, however*, That Hungary may at its option, upon not less than 90 days' advance notice to the United States, pay up to one-half of any interest accruing between December 15, 1923, and December 15, 1928, on the \$1,939,000 principal amount of bonds first to be issued hereunder, in bonds of Hungary dated and bearing interest from the respective dates when the interest to be paid thereby becomes due, with maturities arranged serially to fall on each December 15 in the succeeding years up to December 15, 1985, substantially in the manner provided for the original issue in section 2 of this agreement, and substantially similar in other respects to the original issue of bonds under this agreement.

All payments, whether in cash or in obligations of the United States, to be made by Hungary on account of the principal or interest of any bonds issued or to be issued hereunder and held by the United States, shall be made at the Treasury of the United States in Washington, or, at the option of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and if in cash shall be made in funds immediately available on the date of payment, or if in obligations of the United States shall be in form acceptable to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States under the general regulations of the Treasury Department governing transactions in United States obligations.

5. Exemption from taxation: The principal and interest of all bonds issued or to be issued hereunder shall be paid without deduction for, and shall be exempt from, any and all taxes or other public dues, present or future, imposed by or under authority of Hungary or any political or local taxing authority within the Kingdom of Hungary, whenever, so long as, and to the extent that beneficial ownership is in (a) the Government of the United States, (b) a person, firm, or association neither domiciled nor ordinarily resident in Hungary, or (c) a corporation not organized under the laws of Hungary.

6. Payments before maturity: Hungary may at its option on any interest date or dates, upon not less than 90 days' advance notice to the United States, make advance payments in amounts of \$1,000 or multiples thereof on account of the principal of any bonds issued or to be issued hereunder and held by the United States. Any such advance payments shall first be applied to the principal of any bonds which shall have been issued hereunder on account of interest accruing between December 15, 1923, and December 15, 1928, and then to the principal of any other bonds issued or to be issued hereunder and held by the United States, as may be indicated by Hungary at the time of the payment.

7. Security: The payment of the principal and interest of all bonds issued or to be issued hereunder shall be secured in the same manner and to the same extent as the obligation of Hungary in the principal amount of \$1,685,835.61, described in the preamble to this agreement; that is to say, shall be "a first charge upon all the assets and revenues of Hungary and shall have a priority over costs of reparation under the treaty of Trianon or under any treaty or agreement supplementary thereto, or under arrangements concluded between Hungary and the Allied and Associated Powers during the armistice signed on November 3, 1918": *Provided, however*, That all or any part of such security may be released by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States on such terms and conditions as he may deem necessary or appropriate in order that the United States may cooperate in any program whereby Hungary may be able to finance its immediate needs by the flotation of a loan for reconstruction purposes, if and when substantially all other creditor nations holding obligations of Hungary similar to that held by the United States and described in the preamble to this agreement, to wit, Denmark, France, Great Britain, Holland, Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland, shall release to a similar extent the security enjoyed by such obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury of the United States shall be authorized to decide when such action has been substantially taken.

8. Exchange for marketable obligations: Hungary will issue to the United States at any time, or from time to time, at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, in exchange for any or all of the bonds issued or to be issued hereunder and held by the United States, definitive engraved bonds in form suitable for sale to the public, in such amounts and denominations as the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States may request, in bearer form, with provision for registration as to principal, and/or in fully registered form, and otherwise on the same terms and conditions, as to dates of issue and maturity, rate or rates of interest, security, exemption from taxation, payment in obligations of the United States issued after April 6, 1917, and the like, as the bonds surrendered on such exchange. Hungary will deliver definitive engraved bonds to the United States in accordance herewith within six months of receiving notice of any such request from the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, and pending the delivery of the

definitive engraved bonds will, at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, deliver temporary bonds or interim receipts in form satisfactory to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, within 30 days of the receipt of such request, all without expense to the United States. The United States, before offering any such bonds or interim receipts for sale in Hungary, will first offer them to Hungary for purchase at par and accrued interest, and Hungary shall likewise have the option, in lieu of issuing any such bonds or interim receipts, to make advance redemption, at par and accrued interest, of a corresponding principal amount of bonds issued or to be issued hereunder and held by the United States. Hungary agrees that the definitive engraved bonds called for by this paragraph shall contain all such provisions, and that it will cause to be promulgated all such rules, regulations, and orders as shall be deemed necessary or desirable by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States in order to facilitate the sale of the bonds in the United States, in Hungary, or elsewhere, and that if requested by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States it will use its good offices to secure the listing of the bonds on the stock exchange in Budapest.

9. Cancellation and surrender of relief obligation: Upon the execution of this agreement the payment to the United States of cash in the sum of \$753.04, as provided in paragraph 1 of this agreement, and the delivery to the United States of the \$1,939,000, principal amount of bonds of Hungary first to be issued hereunder, together with satisfactory evidence of authority for the execution of the agreement and the bonds on behalf of Hungary by its envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary at Washington, and of appropriate action by the Reparation Commission so as to assure by its approval to the bonds of Hungary to be issued hereunder the same priority over reparations as that now enjoyed by the obligation of Hungary in the principal amount of \$1,685,835.61 described in the preamble to this agreement, the United States will cancel and surrender to Hungary, at the Treasury of the United States in Washington, the obligation of Hungary last described.

10. Notices: Any notice, request, or consent under the hand of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States shall be deemed and taken as the notice, request, or consent of the United States, and shall be sufficient if delivered at the Legation of Hungary at Washington or at the office of the Minister of Finance in Budapest, and any notice, request, or election from or by Hungary shall be sufficient if delivered to the American Legation at Budapest or to the Secretary of the Treasury at the Treasury of the United States in Washington. The United States, in its discretion, may waive any notice required hereunder, but any such waiver shall be in writing, and shall not extend to or affect any subsequent notice or impair any right of the United States to require notice hereunder.

11. Compliance with legal requirements: Hungary represents and agrees that the execution and delivery of this agreement and of the bonds issued or to be issued hereunder have in all respects been duly authorized, and that all acts, conditions, and legal formalities which should have been completed prior to the making of this agreement and the issuance of bonds hereunder have been completed as required by the laws of Hungary and/or applicable treaties and in conformity therewith.

12. Counterparts: This agreement shall be executed in two counterparts, each of which shall have the force and effect of an original.

In witness whereof Hungary has caused this agreement to be executed on its behalf by its envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary at Washington, thereunto duly authorized, and the United States has likewise caused this agreement to be executed on its behalf by the Secretary of the Treasury, as chairman of the World War Foreign Debt Commission, with the approval of the President, all on the day and year first above written, subject, however, to the approval of Congress, pursuant to the act of Congress approved February 9, 1922, as amended by the act of Congress approved February 28, 1923, notice of which approval, when given by Congress, will be transmitted in due course by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States to the Legation of Hungary at Washington.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE
KINGDOM OF HUNGARY,
By LASZLO SZECHENYI,
Envoy Extraordinary and
Minister Plenipotentiary.
THE GOVERNMENT OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

For the commission:

By A. W. MELLON,
Secretary of the Treasury and
Chairman of the World War Foreign Debt Commission.

Approved:

CALVIN COOLIDGE, President.

EXHIBIT A

(Form of bond)

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE KINGDOM OF HUNGARY

Sixty-two year 3-3½ per cent gold bond

Dated December 15, 1923—maturing December 15, ____.

\$ ____ No. ____.

The Government of the Kingdom of Hungary, hereinafter called Hungary, for value received promises to pay to the Government of the United States of America, hereinafter called the United States, or order, on the 15th day of December, ____, the sum of ____ dollars (\$ ____), and to pay interest upon said principal sum semi-annually on the 15th day of June and December in each year, at the rate of 3 per cent per annum from December 15, 1923, to December 15, 1933, and at the rate of 3½ per cent per annum thereafter until the principal hereof shall have been paid. This bond is payable as to both principal and interest in gold coin of the United States of America of the present standard of value, or, at the option of Hungary, upon not less than 30 days' advance notice to the United States, in any obligations of the United States issued after April 6, 1917, to be taken at par and accrued interest to the date of payment hereunder. This bond is payable as to both principal and interest without deduction for, and is exempt from, any and all taxes and other public dues, present or future, imposed by or under authority of Hungary or any political or local taxing authority within the Kingdom of Hungary, whenever, so long as, and to the extent that beneficial ownership is in (a) the Government of the United States, (b) a person, firm, or association neither domiciled nor ordinarily resident in Hungary, or (c) a corporation not organized under the laws of Hungary. This bond is payable as to both principal and interest at the Treasury of the United States in Washington, D. C.; or, at the option of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

This bond is issued under an agreement dated April 25, 1924, between Hungary and the United States, to which this bond is subject and to which reference is made for a further statement of its terms and conditions.

The payment of the principal and interest on this bond is secured in the same manner and to the same extent as the obligation of Hungary in the principal amount of \$1,685,835.61, described in the preamble to said agreement, subject to release in whole or in part by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States under authority conferred by section 7 of said agreement.

In witness whereof Hungary has caused this bond to be executed in its behalf at the city of Washington, D. C., by its envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary at Washington, thereunto duly authorized.

The Government of the Kingdom of Hungary:

By _____,
Envoy Extraordinary and
Minister Plenipotentiary.

Dated December 15, 1923.

(Back)

The following amounts have been paid upon the principal amount of this bond:

Date _____ Amount paid _____.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] as he may desire.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] has stated the whole case. I do not think it is necessary to add anything. The amount of the proposed loan to Hungary for reconstruction is 250,000,000 gold kroner. The gold kroner is worth 20½ cents, so that the amount would be a little over \$50,000,000. The proposed bonds to the United States, aggregating a little less than \$2,000,000, would be in the same class with other relief loans made by other countries to Hungary. The aggregate of those loans is about \$900,000. It must be stated that for the payment of these loans the revenues of Hungary are pledged, although if the 250,000,000 gold kroner loan for reconstruction should be made, that would have a prior claim. The proposition for giving preference rests on the theory that it is necessary for the very life of that country, and that such a loan would add to the ability of Hungary in the long run to pay this smaller amount due to us. Similar preference for a loan of 650,000,000 gold kroner was granted to Austria.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does the gentleman mean to say that the obligations to the other countries on the part of Hungary were about \$900,000?

Mr. BURTON. Yes; that is in gold values. The indebtedness to these other countries as given out by them is in their paper currencies. To Denmark it is 477,000 kroner, to France 992,000

frances, to Great Britain 128,000 pounds. This last is the largest. Then there is the indebtedness to Holland, Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland. They aggregate at the present value of foreign currency in this country about \$900,000.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It is interesting to note that the total amount was \$2,585,000, of which the United States loaned \$1,685,000, and all the other countries \$900,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the settlement of the indebtedness of the Kingdom of Hungary to the United States of America, made by the World War Foreign Debt Commission and approved by the President upon the following terms, is hereby approved and authorized:

Principal amount of obligation to be funded, \$1,685,835.61; interest accrued thereon to December 15, 1923, at the rate of 4½ per cent per annum, \$253,917.43; total principal and interest accrued and unpaid as of December 15, 1923, \$1,939,753.04; less payment in cash by Hungary on April 25, 1924, \$753.04; total indebtedness to be funded into bonds, \$1,939,000.

The principal of the bonds shall be paid in annual installments on the 15th day of December, up to and including December 15, 1985, on a fixed schedule, subject to the right of the Government of Hungary to make these payments in three-year periods; the amount of the first year's installment shall be \$9,600, the installments to increase with due regularity until, in the 62d year, the amount of the installment shall be \$75,000, the aggregate installments being equal to the total principal of the debt.

The Government of Hungary shall have the right to pay off additional amounts of the principal of the bonds on any interest date upon 90 days' notice.

Interest shall be payable upon the unpaid balances at the following rates, on December 15 and June 15 of each year:

At the rate of 3 per cent per annum, payable semi-annually, from December 15, 1923, to December 15, 1933, and thereafter at the rate of 3½ per cent per annum, payable semiannually until final payment.

The Government of Hungary shall have the right to pay up to one-half of any interest accruing between December 15, 1923, and December 15, 1928, on the \$1,939,000 principal amount of the bonds first to be issued in bonds of Hungary dated as of the respective dates when the interest to be paid thereby becomes due, payable as to principal on the 15th day of December in each succeeding year, up to and including December 15, 1985, on a fixed schedule, in annual installments, increasing with due regularity in proportion to and in the manner provided for payments to be made on account of principal of the original issue of bonds, bearing the same rates of interest and being similar in other respects to such original issue of bonds.

Any payment of interest or of principal shall be made in United States gold coin of the present standard of value or at the option of the Government of Hungary, in any United States Government obligations issued after April 6, 1917, such obligations to be taken at par and accrued interest.

The payment of the principal and interest of the bonds shall be secured in the same manner and to the same extent as the obligation of Hungary which is to be funded: Provided, however, That all or any part of such security may be released by the Secretary of the Treasury on such terms and conditions as he may deem necessary or appropriate in order that the United States may cooperate in any program whereby Hungary may be able to finance its immediate needs by the flotation of a loan for reconstruction purposes, if and when substantially all other creditor nations holding obligations similar to that held by the United States which is to be funded, to wit, Denmark, France, Great Britain, Holland, Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland, shall release to a similar extent the security enjoyed by such obligations.

The Secretary of the Treasury shall be authorized to decide when this action has been substantially taken.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report the bill to the House, with the recommendation that it pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SANDERS of Indiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8905) to authorize the settlement of the indebtedness of the Kingdom of Hungary to the United States of America, had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that it pass.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CRISP, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I desire to prefer a unanimous consent request, that on Wednesday of this week, when the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER] concludes his address of 30 minutes, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOCH], both members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, shall each have 20 minutes' time in which to address the House upon section 15a of the transportation act, which is the subject matter of the address of the gentleman from Nebraska.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that on Wednesday of this week, when the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER] concludes his address, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOCH] each have 20 minutes' time in which to address the House upon section 15a of the transportation act. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

STOCK-RAISING HOMESTEADS

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on Senate bill 381.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon calls up the conference report on Senate bill 381, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 381) "to amend section 2 of the act entitled 'An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes,' approved December 29, 1916 (Stat. L. p. 862)," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 2 and 3.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 4, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "but no right to occupy such lands shall be acquired by reason of said application until said lands have been designated as stock-raising lands, unless the applicant actually establishes his residence and resides on the land"; and the House agree to the same.

N. J. SINNOTT,
ADDISON T. SMITH,
JOHN E. RAKER,

Managers on the part of the House.

E. F. LADD,
ROBT. N. STANFIELD,
A. A. JONES,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 381) to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes," approved December 29, 1916 (39 Stat. L. p. 862), submit the following statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on:

The action agreed on in no way changes the purpose of the House amendments, but merely makes clear an ambiguity in the House amendment which might otherwise be subject to the interpretation that only the actual land on which the residence was located could be occupied by the entryman.

N. J. SINNOTT,
ADDISON T. SMITH,
JOHN E. RAKER,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous report of the managers on the part of the House and also on the part of the Senate. In the House amendments there was an ambiguity that might leave the action of the House amendments subject to the interpretation that only the land actually occupied by the house could be occupied by the entryman, whereas it was intended that as soon as he established his residence upon the land applied for he could occupy all the land, and the effect of the action of the conferees is to clear up that ambiguity.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. O'CONNELL of New York, indefinitely, on account of sickness in family.

To Mr. VARE, for several days, on account of death of his sister.

To Mr. TAGUE (at the request of Mr. CONNERY), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. BANKHEAD, for four days, on account of important business.

To Mr. BOIES, indefinitely, on account of important business.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it seems that next Wednesday is to be largely devoted to speech making. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes on that day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to address the House on Wednesday next for 20 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes on Wednesday next. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

HAND PLAN—REIMBURSEMENT COUNTIES—NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks by printing as a part of them what is known as the Hand plan on reforestation and reimbursement, together with extracts from the laws of the various States regarding taxation, as well as information and statements I have received from various people over the United States in regard to reimbursement to counties wherein the United States takes over and reserves public lands for providing timber for the whole people of the United States. I wanted to make my statement clear, so that there will be no misunderstanding of it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend the matter he has indicated in the Record by inserting the various documents he has mentioned. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, under the permission given me by the House, I will take the opportunity to discuss what is known in the West as the "Hand plan" of reimbursement of the counties in the 16 Western public-land States where forest reserves have been created, as it affects those counties' revenues by reason of the lands thus withdrawn being relieved of taxation, and in turn the several counties where the lands are located, being deprived of taxes that they would get were the lands in private ownership.

The "Hand plan" provides for the Federal Government reimbursing the several counties in which the national forests are located by way of payment by the Government to the counties an amount that would be paid in taxes by a private owner were the lands in private ownership.

This plan does not in the least question the foresight and wisdom in establishing national forests nor in being maintained.

They are created for all the people of the United States, for present and future use. The Government holds these national forests as a proprietor for all its people. They will redound to the benefit of all the citizens of this country. Therefore this payment to the counties in reimbursement of what they lose in the way of taxes not being assessed and collected from the Federal Government, should come out of the General Treasury of the Federal Government, to which fund the whole citizenry contributes.

To carry on this plan of county reimbursement, on May 25, 1922, H. R. 11789—Sixty-seventh Congress, second session—was introduced.

On December 5, 1923—Sixty-eighth Congress, first session—H. R. 148 was introduced. The two bills are identical in language. They both authorize the Secretary of the Interior to carry on the provisions thereof.

After reflection it seemed more appropriate to have the Secretary of Agriculture perform this work. Therefore, I introduced H. R. 8844 on April 22, 1924. The same as the other two bills, with the exception that the Secretary of Agriculture is named in the latter bill instead of the Secretary of the Interior. H. R. 8844 is as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8844) to provide compensation in lieu of taxes for the several States with respect to certain lands of the United States within the borders of said States, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That when used in this act, unless the context indicates otherwise, the term "lands of the United States" means lands set apart, reserved, or withdrawn under the provisions of section 24 of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1891, entitled "An act to repeal timber culture laws, and for other purposes," and acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto, or obtained or acquired under the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. L. p. 961), and acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto.

The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 2. That the United States Government hereby assumes, subject to the conditions of this act or any subsequent act of Congress, the payment to the several States of sums of money equivalent to the amounts which such States would receive from the taxation of said lands of the United States within their respective borders if such lands were owned by individuals.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary shall, as soon as practicable after the passage of this act and annually thereafter, at such time of the year as the legislature of the State may designate, send a statement to the governor, or such other officer as the legislature may designate, of every State in which such lands are located, describing the location, size, and character of all lands of the United States within the border of such State, together with such information respecting such lands as he may possess which may be useful in properly determining their value.

SEC. 4. That no payments shall be made to any State under the provisions of this act until such State has, with respect to the lands of the United States in question, acting through its officers and agents duly authorized therefor—

(1) Properly assessed such lands of the United States at a rate no higher than that at which other similar lands within such State are assessed.

(2) Applied to such assessed valuation a factor no higher than the tax rate applied to the assessed value of other similar lands within such State.

(3) Secured in this manner, a figure from which shall be deducted any allowances made by such State to its taxpayers in similar cases for prompt payment of taxes or for any other reason.

(4) Certified the figures so reached with respect to each piece of such lands of the United States, accompanied by statements as to the methods employed in arriving at such figures, to the Secretary.

(5) Furnished the Secretary with such further information as he may request respecting the methods employed in valuing and assessing such lands of the United States and in assessing and taxing other similar lands within the State.

(6) Complied with such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe for carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. That the Secretary shall receive and examine the figures submitted by the States under the provisions of section 4. In the event that any State shall submit figures with respect to any lands of the United States, based (1) on a higher valuation than the Secretary believes to be the actual value of such lands, or (2) on a higher rate of assessment or of taxation than he believes is employed in the case of other similar lands within such State, or (3) in whole or in part on any other improper consideration, he shall so revise and reduce such figures as to allow and compensate for such error or miscalculation. Such revised and reduced figures shall be final and conclusive when so determined by the Secretary, except that he may, in his discretion, permit any State affected by such revision or reduction to offer such evidence and argument respecting the matters in question as he may deem advisable, after which the Secretary may change his determination in such manner as he shall deem proper.

SEC. 6. That the Secretary shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury annually and as promptly as practicable with respect to every State receiving benefits hereunder the amounts to which such State is entitled under the provisions of this act. The Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon cause such amounts to be paid to the designated officers of the State indicated. Whenever the Secretary shall deter-

mine that any State has, for any reason, been paid more than the amounts to which it is entitled under the provisions of this act, he shall deduct such overpayments from the next amounts certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to such State.

Sec. 7. That no payments shall be made to any State, under the provisions of this act, with respect to any such lands of the United States which do not remain such for the entire tax year of the State in which they are located, nor with respect to any such lands of the United States which the State might lawfully tax by reason of the fact that the beneficial interest in such lands is not vested in the United States.

Sec. 8. That the Secretary shall have power to prescribe rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this act.

Sec. 9. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary of the Treasury from time to time to make the payments required by this act.

The "Hand plan," county reimbursement plan, written by Mr. Charles E. Hand, and issued by the Placer County Chamber of Commerce, Eldorado County Chamber of Commerce, and boards of supervisors of Placer and Eldorado Counties jointly, presents the subject in concrete form, and is:

FOREST EXCHANGE BILLS AND COUNTY REIMBURSEMENT PLAN

The united chambers of commerce of Eldorado and Placer Counties and the joint boards of supervisors of said counties submit the following as their views on the exchange bills now pending in Congress and also advance reasons why the Federal Government should reimburse the counties in which forest districts lie, and earnestly request the hearty cooperation and indorsement of chambers of commerce, boards of supervisors, and other civic bodies in a matter which we deem to be right and just and which is of vast importance to California as well as to other Western States and is of particular interest to those counties, portions of which are in the Shasta, Plumas, Tahoe, and Eldorado National Forests, for the reason that the exchange bills referred to herein cover those particular forests.

In order to show the position of Congressman JOHN E. RAKER on this subject we quote from a letter received by this committee from Mr. RAKER a few days ago, as follows:

"The Hand proposition is right and to my mind unanswerable, but while I have been working on it in the House certain Senators have been working on it on a little different line in the Senate. We have not proceeded very far because of the general opposition in the East to provide for taxation for western counties in which forest reserves are situated, and then the contention that we are receiving now as much, if not more than we could by direct taxation, from the revenue and receipts from permits, timber, etc., from the national forests. However, notwithstanding this contention and opposition, the Hand proposal will continue to have my favorable and earnest consideration and attention."

The district forester in his statement on the exchange bills announces the policy of the Government, as follows:

"Our first energies should be directed toward acquiring lands which are already within the national-forest boundaries and are chiefly valuable for timber production and watershed protection, etc.

"Secondly, our energies should be directed to a logical rounding out of present forest units. It is a fact that our present boundaries are in many cases unsatisfactory, many irregularities being made for the sole purpose of excluding private lands at the borders of the forests where the excluded areas are absolutely forest lands. It is extremely desirable to acquire them and re-form our boundaries along permanent physical lines.

"The Forest Service was consulted in drawing the boundaries of the various bills introduced, and that the boundaries of the forests mentioned do not now include areas of fine timber-producing lands which should ultimately be in public ownership, and it is hoped that through land-exchange legislation that they may be gradually acquired."

The matter was brought to the attention of the Eldorado County Chamber of Commerce and was by that body referred to its legislative committee, and Mr. Hand was added as a special member for the occasion, and Supervisor Schroeder was appointed by the board of supervisors to represent that body in this matter.

In the discussion in the separate chambers and also at the joint meeting of the chambers and boards of supervisors of Placer and Eldorado Counties the policy of the Government acquiring privately owned lands within the present boundaries, and also acquiring privately owned lands within the new or proposed boundaries of the forests were considered very objectionable because of the fact that every additional acre acquired by the Government ceases to be revenue producing, thus adding to the already overburden of the counties. The chambers of commerce and boards of supervisors believe the principle on which the national forests were created to be right, in so far as conservation is concerned, and we have no objection to the Government

acquiring privately owned lands, within or without the forests, provided legislation whereby the National Government would reimburse the counties along the lines suggested herein later, and which the bill prepared by Representative JOHN E. RAKER two years ago at the request of Mr. Hand would remedy, thus relieving the counties and placing the burden where it belongs, even though we are not fully satisfied with the exchange provisions in the four bills, for we view them as along similar lines as the old scrip and lieu land acts, and just as wide open to fraud.

A little over a year ago Mr. Paul G. Redington, district forester at San Francisco, sent out a circular letter to the various forest supervisors in his district, in which he quotes from a paper on the subject of exchange lands within forests which was read at Spokane by Mr. Huntington Taylor, general manager of the Edward Rutledge Timber Co., and which Mr. Redington advised "will form a basis to argue on should you—meaning his forest supervisors—have the opportunity to discuss the general subject with boards of supervisors and other public officials."

In the paper read by Mr. Taylor, he says that—

"The question of the effect of land exchange on the tax receipts of the States and counties is important, but there seems to be small cause for public alarm."

We certainly believe the effect on the counties to be "important," so much so that unless relief measures are forthcoming, some, if not all, of the counties will be seriously injured in their sources of revenue from taxation. Mr. Taylor says that "in the timber regions the stumpage owner will have a keen interest in tax matters for a good many years to come, and there will be small likelihood of his supporting any measure which will mean an abrupt increase in his taxes."

The big timber interests are behind and backing the exchange bills, consequently they must be satisfied; so also is the district forester, Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior, but how about the counties, and what provision has been made for reimbursing them for this loss of revenue? Have the county boards of supervisors been consulted? Are they willing that the boundaries of the forests be enlarged by the taking in of vast areas of lands outside the present boundaries and from which they are now receiving tax revenue, said lands by the exchange bills to become publicly owned and therefore not subject to taxation? Are the taxpayers who maintain county government in counties a portion of which is in the Shasta, Plumas, Eldorado, and Tahoe Forests, willing that cut-over lands, now owned by private individuals, be taken in exchange for standing timber, thus losing their percentage on stumpage sales? We do not think so, and believe that they are entitled to consideration and to be heard in the matter.

On the subject of cut-over lands, owned by private individuals within the forests, Mr. Taylor mentions the possibility of the timber concerns allowing the taxes to become delinquent and uses the following language:

"Unquestionably as time goes on, and the accumulated burden of taxes becomes heavier, the private owner will be forced to unload his cut-over lands."

This is a serious problem, for should it happen the lands would become delinquent, be sold to the State for taxes, and would cease to be revenue producing, or would fall into the hands of stock raisers and would lose most of their value as forest-producing lands. We are convinced that the Government should acquire the cut-over lands and allow them to reforest, but this should not be done at the expense of the counties in which the forests are located. The Federal Government should reimburse the counties, thus placing the burden where it belongs—that is, upon all of the people of the United States—and the counties should not be compelled to bear this burden for possibly 200 years, which time it would take for reforestation.

Quoting again from Mr. Taylor:

"The national forests now turn over 35 per cent of their gross incomes to the counties in which they are situated. In some localities this already overbalances the tax returns which would have been secured if the lands had passed to private ownership," and so forth.

If the statement of Mr. Taylor is true, then, from the standpoint of the National Government, it is but another argument in favor of reimbursing the counties on a valuation basis, as it would be a gain for the Nation, and there is no question but that the counties would be better satisfied. We disagree with Mr. Taylor and doubt if there is a forest in the United States where the above is true, unless it be in one particular year, but surely it is not true covering a period of years. It is not so with any of the forests in California. Plumas County is receiving more revenue from stumpage sales than is any other county in the State. We have compiled the figures in all of the forests in this State and know that they are receiving very little returns from the sale of Government-owned timber.

In the year 1921 the Federal Government paid into the treasuries of the 39 counties in California in which district forests lie the sum of \$132,406, or an average of about \$340 per county.

The greater part of the Eldorado National Forest is in Eldorado County, and is in part in Placer, Amador, Alpine, and a small part in

Nevada. In the year 1915 the Federal Government paid into the treasury of Eldorado County as returns from all sources, including timber sales, pasturage, and so forth, the sum of \$1,271.34; in 1916, \$1,947.44; in 1917, \$1,466.22; in 1918, \$1,823.88; in 1919, \$2,485.80; and in 1920 the sum of \$2,828.02, making a grand total for a period of six years of \$11,782.80, an average of less than \$2,000 a year. The figures quoted are taken from the books of the treasurer of Eldorado County, and his certificate was forwarded to Representative RAKER, and are not based on the mere say so of some person who is trying to create the impression that the counties are receiving substantial revenue from the forests. Trinity County alone has upward of 16,000,000 feet of Government-owned standing timber, and practically none of it is being sold, hence no revenue, and such is the case in the other counties, parts of which are in forest reserves. The large timber concerns now operating are not buying timber from the Government on a stumpage basis but are cutting over their own lands, thus decreasing their assessed valuation, and in this county they get a reduction in assessed valuation of \$13 per acre on each acre cut over; so you see it means decreased valuation of privately owned lands within the forests and increased valuation on lands outside the forest to produce revenue sufficient to maintain county government.

A vast amount of timber is now being advertised for sale in the Lassen National Forest. Should this sale be consummated the counties in this forest would receive their percentage; but how about the next 150 or 200 years, which time it would take for reforestation, and what would the average be per year?

We have examined the exchange bill relative to the Eldorado Forest and find that in addition to the 840,128 acres already within the old forest boundaries, this bill, if enacted into law, would take in 133,000 additional acres, 125,551 of which additional acres are in Eldorado County.

A careful study and examination has been made, and we find that a large portion of the 125,551 acres aforesaid is privately owned and on which taxes are now being paid to the county, and that the present assessed valuation of what is in private hands is \$905,924. This valuation computed at our average tax rate of \$2.28 on the \$100 valuation means that we will lose in taxes upward of \$20,000 per year, in addition to what we are already losing in the original forest, should the boundaries proposed in the exchange bills relative to this forest and the spirit of the bill and declared policy of the Government, that of "acquiring all privately owned lands," be carried out; and if it is not carried out, what then is the purpose of the bills?

The matter of the loss of an assessed valuation to Eldorado County of \$905,924 and an annual loss of upward of \$20,000 in taxes may not be considered much by some of the large counties of the United States; but to us, with a total assessed valuation of about \$10,000,000 and a population of about 7,000—it seems to us to be quite a considerable sum and prompts us to again ask that before the exchange bills pass provision be made to reimburse the counties. The Department of Agriculture should see these things, and the justice of what we ask should appeal to its officials as well as to the Congressman and Senator from East and West, North or South.

In the matter of the Tahoe Forest, we have computed the acreage that the bill will add to the present forest reserve, and we find 452,480 acres will be annexed to the already large acreage of the old forest should that bill become the law. We find that the proposed new boundaries of the Shasta and Plumas Forests will add to these forests hundreds of thousands of acres, from many of which said acres the counties are now receiving revenue from taxation which will be lost to them should the bills be passed and the policy of the Government be carried out.

A glance at the map of the United States showing the national forests thereon will convince a person of the importance to the West of a relief measure such as we ask, and more particularly to California, with a series of national forests along almost the entire east side of the State and for many miles along the coast. It would provide for the National Government reimbursing the forest counties on a valuation basis of Government-owned lands, the valuation to be fixed as per privately owned lands within the same forest or upon a standing-timber basis, either of which we believe to be just and equitable ways to solve the problem.

We wish to make our position clear, and being more familiar with the Eldorado National Forest than with any of the other forests we will use it as an example. The present forest contains 840,128 acres of land, 553,388 acres of which are Government-owned lands and, being in a national forest, are not subject to entry or to taxation. There are 246,740 acres of land in this forest, owned by private individuals, and the average assessed valuation of this privately owned land is about \$12 per acre. As above stated, there are 553,388 acres owned by the Government, which said last number of acres of land at the average assessed valuation of \$12 per acre, as per privately owned lands within said forest, is a loss to us in assessed valuation of \$6,500,000 and will continue to be so long as the law remains as it is.

The fact that \$6,000,000 is lost to Placer, Eldorado, Amador, Alpine, and a part of Nevada in assessed valuation means at our

present rate of taxation we are losing in taxes annually about \$150,000. And if the exchange bill relative to this forest is passed, it will take an additional \$20,000 per annum from the revenues of Eldorado County. I am assuming that those who are familiar with the rapidity with which timber and grazing lands have been taken up in the past will realize that every acre of available land within all forests would long ago have been in private hands had not the reserves been created.

The Government-owned timber on the Eldorado reserve has been cruised and estimated, and the figures disclose that there are 4,841,862,000 feet, board measure. An estimate of \$1.50 stumpage per thousand feet, which is a low estimate indeed, would fix a valuation of more than \$7,000,000 on the timber alone, and with the land values would make a total valuation of upward of \$10,000,000.

The Department of Agriculture fixed a valuation of \$800,000,000 on the national forests inside the State of California. This amount includes the valuation of all resources of the forests, such as land values, timber, forage, mineral, and water resources.

In the year 1920 the United States Bureau of Public Roads fixed a valuation on the timber and forage resources in the national forests of California at \$146,599,866. The valuation by the Bureau of Public Roads was made for the purpose of determining what each county in which there are national forests is entitled to for road building from the Federal Government under the act of July 11, 1916.

The value placed on timber and forage resources in the various counties is as follows:

Placer County	\$1,896,353
Nevada County	1,062,235
Amador County	746,361
Sierra County	4,807,023
Eldorado County	4,256,417

In the year 1921 Placer County received from the Federal Government as returns from all national-forest resources the sum of \$2,998; Nevada County received \$2,094; Amador County received \$351; Sierra County \$5,085; and Eldorado \$1,984.

Interesting comparisons can be made by computing the taxes on the national-forest resources at the present county-tax rate of the various counties, and for this comparison we will use 50 per cent of the valuation as fixed by the United States Bureau of Public Roads, which included the valuation placed by that bureau on timber and grazing resources only. On a 50 per cent basis in Amador County the taxes would be \$8,884 instead of \$312; in Placer County, \$25,999.75 instead of \$2,998; Nevada County, \$18,589.65 instead of \$2,094; Eldorado County, \$59,589 instead of \$1,984; Lassen County, \$34,882 instead of \$6,951; Plumas County, \$147,665 instead of \$17,806; Siskiyou County, \$207,138 instead of \$10,470, and if the national-forest resources in California were assessed at half the value as placed thereon by the United States Bureau of Public Roads and taxed at a 2.5 per cent the total revenue for all the counties in which forest districts lie would be \$1,832,498 instead of \$132,406, which last-named amount being the sum total of what was paid to all of the counties for the year 1921.

Since \$132,406 was the total amount based on sales of timber and grazing resources and divided proportionately and paid into the treasuries of the various counties in which national forests lie, how in the face of these figures can any person who has the knowledge and regard for facts make statements to the effect that the returns from timber sales, grazing, etc., overbalance the tax return which would have been secured if the lands had passed to private ownership?

In six counties—Lassen, Plumas, Sierra, Siskiyou, Trinity, and Tuolumne—the value of national-forest resources is greater than the assessed value of the real estate, improvements, and personal property outside the forests. In Sierra, Trinity, and Tuolumne Counties if the national-forest resources were assessed at half the value placed thereon by the United States Bureau of Public Roads they would still be greater than the assessed value of the real estate outside.

Some interesting comparisons can also be made as to percentage of area of counties within and without national-forest boundaries. Three counties—Del Norte, Plumas, and Trinity—have approximately two-thirds of their area in national forests. Four counties—Modoc, Sierra, Siskiyou, and Tulare—have over 40 per cent of their area in the national forests. Three counties—Eldorado, Fresno, and Tuolumne—have over one-third of their area in the national forests. Five counties—Glenn, Lassen, Madera, Placer, and Shasta—have one-fifth of their area in national forests, and Tehama County has almost one-fifth. Five timbered counties—Del Norte, Plumas, Trinity, Modoc, and Tuolumne—have a lesser area assessed than is in the national forests.

We are firm believers in the conservation of our natural resources and consider ourselves as friends of the Forest Service, and are sure that the enactment of a law such as we propose will result in placing the Forest Service on a more firm basis, but under the present law do not believe the burden properly distributed. Instead of the few people who reside in counties a part of which happens to be in a district forest being compelled to bear the burden, the 110,000,000 people who reside in all of the United States should assume their just proportion, for surely they are as much interested in conservation as are the people who live in a county or combination of counties comprising

a district forest. The man who contemplates building in New York, Washington, or San Francisco, on the farms of the Middle West, or in the Prairie States, must have timber; his interest in that respect lies in our national forests; yet the community in which he lives is not restricted as are the counties in which the forests are, because of the fact that all of their lands are open to entry and to taxation. No part of Sacramento or any of the other valley or bay counties are in a forest reserve; the forest counties have been cut in two, so far as taxation is concerned, for the benefit of those counties and also for the benefit of all of the people of the United States.

The entire California delegation in Congress should be behind us in this matter; and they can not say that they are not interested in the welfare of their sister counties, for they are. Our prosperity adds to their prosperity. We are decreasing in population, all of which hurts business in their counties, and such is the case in nearly all of the counties in which district forests lie. The outside counties must look to these forests for material for their factories and shops, and if they carry out their building program they must have timber; they must have box stuff for their orchards, and must look to these forests for electricity for lights and power and for water for domestic and irrigation purposes. We perform all police powers, furnish the courts, finance the prosecutions of all persons committing crimes within the forests. We must construct roads, build bridges, and erect and maintain schools within the forests; then why are we not entitled to be reimbursed?

There are bright prospects of the passage of the Raker reimbursement measure, and the benefits to the counties would be many and far-reaching. It is a matter of mutual interest, and cooperation is necessary. We shall be pleased to hear from you, and trust that you will take immediate action by writing your Congressman and both Senators urging their hearty indorsement of the reimbursement plan.

Respectfully,

ELDORADO COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
AND BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.
PLACER COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
AND BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.

When H. R. 4830, "A bill to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor," was being considered by the House (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 16, 1924, pp. 6501-6514; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 23, 1924, pp. 6977-6997) I offered the provisions of H. R. 8844 as an amendment, but upon a point of order it was ruled out of order. The provisions of H. R. 8844 should have gone on that bill. (H. R. 4830, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, was approved June 7, 1924—Public, No. 270, Sixty-eighth Congress.)

On the provisions of section 7 of H. R. 4830 and its effect on taxation I submit the views of Mr. Hand, which are to the point and go to the provisions of reimbursement provided for in H. R. 8844:

PLACERVILLE, May 10, 1924.

HON. JOHN E. RAKER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE: After reading the proceedings of the House when H. R. 4830 was under consideration, I wish to extend to you and also to Representative Box, of Texas, my most earnest congratulations. The bill contains some good features, but section 7 is an outrage on the rights of the States, and I would like to know just when the power was delegated to the Federal Government to interfere in local matters and exempt from taxation individuals and corporations in the insidious manner in which it was done in this case.

Centralization of power in the Federal Government is taking place very rapidly, and the rights of the States are constantly disappearing, and it would seem about time that usurpation of purely State powers should be stopped and we get back to first principles. The taking of Federal control over local matters in a way which could not be done directly under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights should not be tolerated.

If the Government wishes to assist the timberman, it should be done in such a manner that all sections of the Nation would make equal contribution and not, as in this case, place another burden on the forest counties. If the Government as a whole can not afford to finance the national forests, then it should not expect the sparsely settled forest counties to do this for it. The forest counties should simply pay in proportion to what is paid by other sections of the Nation—no more, no less—and all should be paid out of the general funds of the Nation; then all would contribute to a national necessity.

The questionable benefits which section 7 of the bill gives to the timber owner is taken wholly from the forest counties. It reduces assessable valuation in those units of government, consequently commensurate values must be found elsewhere or the tax rate increased in order to raise sufficient funds to finance local communities.

Section 7 of the bill enables owners to donate lands "chiefly valuable for the growing of timber to the United States." They can do-

nate or devise that intangible thing known as title, but reserve to themselves everything in sight, such as timber, mineral, grazing rights, and other rights, and time only can tell what claims will be made under the "other rights" reservation. There is no limit to the time when these rights shall cease; they are perpetual to themselves, their heirs and assigns forever. The owners will convey absolutely nothing of value. There is no material value in that intangible thing known as title; they will reserve all of the values, such as timber, forage, minerals, and other rights, and have escaped all forms of taxation on the land.

It may be that the lighthouse Mr. CLARKE referred to and on which Mr. MADDEN commented is to be used in an endeavor to throw light on the invisible thing known as title. Mr. CLARKE may wish to know just what kind of a thing title is when sewed up in the manner it is in his bill, for the naked eye discloses nothing that the owners will actually convey; the owner will still retain the use, benefits, and profits. We know that the bill deprives the counties of the taxes they are now receiving on the lands, but that benefit accrues to the timberman and not to the Federal Government. The Federal Government has taken it from the counties and given it to the timberman. When conveyance is made to the United States the owner will be relieved of the expense of fire protection; his lands and crops will be perpetually cared for by the United States at no expense whatever to himself. You will note the owner is always on the right side.

Mr. CLARKE could use his lighthouse in enforcing the preferential clause of section 7, which also provides that preference in sales shall be given to those "engaged in agriculture in the States in which such national forest is situated." In following each board through the many avenues of trade, and when finally satisfied that it had found its proper place on the farm, the lighthouse will be useful in guiding back to the forest the multitude of officials necessary to enforce this provision.

I will be pleased to receive a few more copies of your bill, No. 148, and would also like to have a couple of copies of 4830 and also a couple of copies of the McNary bill.

With kind personal regards, I remain,

Very truly yours,

C. E. HAND.

The Legislature of California on May 11, 1921, passed Assembly Joint Resolution No. 17, reading as follows:

CHAPTER 60

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 17, RELATIVE TO THE COMPENSATION OF COUNTIES CONTAINING LAND IN NATIONAL FOREST RESERVES EXEMPT FROM LOCAL TAXATION

(Filed with secretary of state May 11, 1921)

Whereas by national law and under national regulations many thousand acres of land in California have been placed in national forests; and

Whereas the counties in which such lands are situated derive no revenue therefrom in the form of taxation, yet give the same fire, police, and health protection; and

Whereas these national forests are set apart for the use and enjoyment of all of the people of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly and senate jointly, That it is just and equitable that the National Government recompense the counties in which such lands are situated by reason of the inability of these counties to secure revenue therefrom in the form of taxation; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from California in Congress be memorialized to use their influence to secure the enactment of such national laws as will secure to the counties affected just compensation in this matter; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the assembly be, and he hereby is, directed to forward copies of these resolutions to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from the State of California. (Statutes and Amendments to the Codes, California, 1921, pp. 2194-2195.)

The Legislature of California at its forty-fifth session, on May 8, 1923, adopted a joint resolution approving the purposes of H. R. 11789 (H. R. 8844, 68th Cong., hereinbefore set out in full), which joint resolution is in words and figures following:

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE,
ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, FORTY-FIFTH SESSION,
Sacramento, Calif., June 13, 1923.

Please note the following joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of California May 8, 1923:

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 17—Relative to memorializing Congress to adopt a bill introduced by Hon. JOHN E. RAKER to provide compensation in lieu of taxes for the several States with respect to certain lands of the United States within the borders of said States, and for other purposes.

Whereas Hon. JOHN E. RAKER, Member of Congress from the second district of California, has introduced a bill in the House of Representatives (H. R. 11789) which provides: "That the United States Govern-

ment hereby assumes, subject to the conditions of this act or any subsequent act of Congress, the payment to the several States of sums of money equivalent to the amounts which such States would receive from the taxation of said lands of the United States within their respective borders if such lands were owned by individuals"; and

Whereas the amount which California would receive from the taxation of the lands of the United States within the boundaries of the State and "set apart, reserved, or withdrawn under the provisions of section 24 of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1891," would be over \$5,000,000 annually; and

Whereas this amount would be distributed almost entirely among the remote and mountainous counties of the State, thus greatly benefiting communities where assessed valuations are low by reason of the exemption from annual taxation of the lands of the United States above referred to; and where the cost of building and upkeep of roads and highways is high on account of the mountainous surface; and where the population is sparse because these lands of the United States are withdrawn from settlement, improvement, and development under the homestead laws; and where forest depletion, contrary to economic demands and forest perpetuation, are the results of high taxes; and

Whereas the lands of the United States above referred to, comprising at least half the area of several mountain counties and nearly one-fifth the total area of the State, while exempt from annual taxation, are being put to commercial and industrial uses for the benefit of all the people of the United States, which places these lands on the same basis as to use with assessed and taxed lands used for the same purposes; and

Whereas it is only just and right that a heavy burden of local annual taxation should not be placed on the people of any State in which and by reason of the fact that extensive areas of land and great natural resources are set aside and reserved for the economic use and benefit of all the people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly and senate jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California approves the purposes of the bill referred to and respectfully requests its support and adoption by the Congress of the United States at the earliest possible date; and be it further

Resolved, That any moneys returned to the State of California under said or any similar bill be so returned to said State for the benefit of the several counties in which any such lands are situated, the same to be paid to said counties in the proportion in which said lands are so situated.

Resolved, That the speaker of the assembly be authorized to transmit copies of this resolution by mail to the Governors of the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Utah, Nevada, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona with the request that similar action be taken by their respective legislatures; and be it further

Resolved, That the speaker of the assembly be authorized to transmit copies of this resolution, by mail, to all the Members of Congress and the Senate of the United States.

FRANK F. MERRIAM,

Speaker.

Attest:

ARTHUR A. OHNIMUS,

Chief Clerk.

Mr. Hand made the following statement before the Senate Select Committee on Reforestation:

PLACERVILLE, CALIF., October 1, 1923.

Hon. JOHN E. RAKER,

Alturas, Calif.

MY DEAR JUDGE: I see by the press that you have arrived in the land of the free, and that you will be home in a few days.

Judge, your impression of Europe must have been a bad one, for I see you wish to stop immigration for at least 10 years. We have been protecting infant industries for years at the behest of the manufacturer, but have not given sufficient consideration to infant Americans, and I have always maintained that the basic way to protect American labor is to put up bars to immigration. However, immigration is not the subject I wish to write you on.

The committee of the United States Senate on national forests and reforestation, the personnel of which is Senator CHARLES L. McNARY, of Oregon; Senator MOSES, of New Hampshire; Senator COZZENS, of Michigan; Senator HARRISON, of Mississippi; and Senator FLETCHER, of Florida, are making a study of forest problems with a view to preparing a bill for introduction at the session of Congress which convenes in December next.

This committee has held hearings in several of the States, and on September 6 last a hearing was held at San Francisco, at which time I was present and presented for their consideration the plan of county reimbursement as embodied in the bill introduced by you in the Sixty-seventh Congress.

I was nicely treated by the Senators. Senator McNARY informed me that I raised the two most important questions to be considered by their committee, and he assured me that the plan would receive earnest consideration. He agrees that the counties are not now being suffi-

ciently reimbursed. However, I am of the opinion that he leans rather to an increased percentage than to the valuation basis, but I also feel that he could be easily convinced that the valuation basis is right. Can you not take this phase of the subject up with him?

I am inclosing you a copy of the argument I made, all of which will appear in the official record of the hearing.

Would be pleased to hear from you, and should you write Senator McNARY would like to have a carbon copy of your letter for my files.

With best wishes, I am

Yours very truly,

C. E. HAND.

First. The enactment of a law such as is embodied in bill H. R. 11789, introduced by Representative JOHN E. RAKER at the second session of the Sixty-seventh Congress.

Second. Extension of the boundaries of the present forests and the creation of new national forests where practicable.

The rapidity with which the forests are being denuded means that something in the way of reforestation and conservation must be done to meet future needs, but it should be accomplished in a just way so that the hearty cooperation of all will be assured. The subject is one of large scope and will permit of consideration from various angles in order that results be accomplished and justice meted out to the counties in which national forests are located.

The Raker bill, if enacted into law, would provide compensation in lieu of taxes for the several States with respect to forest lands of the United States within the borders of said States.

The following is a portion of the Raker bill:

"Be it enacted, etc., That when used in this act, unless the context indicates otherwise, the term 'lands of the United States' means lands set apart, reserved, or withdrawn under the provisions of section 24 of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1891, entitled 'An act to repeal timber culture laws, and for other purposes.'

"SEC. 2. That the United States Government hereby assumes, subject to the conditions of this act or any subsequent act of Congress, the payment to the several States of the sums of money equivalent to the amounts which such States would receive from the taxation of said lands of the United States within their respective borders if such lands were owned by individuals."

You will note that the Raker bill provides for reimbursement of counties on a valuation basis and not on the percentage of timber sales and grazing as is now the law. I believe that this provision of the Raker bill is right, for the reason that the forest counties are not now being adequately reimbursed, nor will an increase of the percentage from sales of timber and grazing cure this condition. The exchange bills have been passed and the timber owner will be availing himself of the provisions of these acts and trading his cut-over lands for standing timber, value for value, no money will pass, hence no percentage for the counties in which the exchange is made, and during the period of reforestation the forest counties will be compelled to bear the burden, with no returns from that portion of the lands under reforestation until the timber shall have matured, a matter of some 200 years.

Oregon has approximately 15,000,000 acres in national forests, while there are 18,891,161 acres in the national forests of California, or about one-fifth of the total area of this State. In the year 1921 the Federal Government paid to the State of California the sum of \$132,406 as returns for county shares in the timber sales and grazing. Can this amount be considered just or equitable reimbursement when approximately 19,000,000 acres are included in the area of the national forests of this State and a valuation of \$300,000,000 placed thereon by the Department of Agriculture, and a valuation of \$146,599,866 on two of the resources of the California forests, viz, timber and grazing by the United States Bureau of Public Roads?

The United States Bureau of Public Roads fixed a valuation on the timber and forage resources of the Eldorado National Forest at \$4,256,417, and the Department of Agriculture a valuation on all of the resources, including land values, timber, forage, mineral, and water of this forest at \$10,000,000. The Federal Government paid into the treasury of Eldorado County as returns from all sources, including timber sales, forage, etc., in 1915, \$1,271.94; in 1916, \$1,947.44; in 1917, \$1,466.22; in 1918, \$1,828.88; in 1919, \$2,445.80; in 1920, \$2,828.02, making a total for a period of six years of less than \$2,000 per year, and if the percentage had been increased from 25 to 50 per cent that county would have been receiving for the period above named an average of less than \$4,000 per annum. A sum which in no sense could be considered as just and adequate reimbursement. Over 34 per cent of Eldorado County is in a national forest, therefore the lands are not open to entry, and can never be taxed to help pay the expense of defraying county government. The same conditions prevail in all of the forest counties of the United States, whether in Oregon, Michigan, Mississippi, New Hampshire, Florida, California, or any other State.

To relieve this condition it will be necessary that instead of the few people who reside in counties a part of which happens to be in a district forest being compelled, as under the present law or an

increased percentage law, to sustain this loss of revenue unaided the 110,000,000 people who reside in all of the United States should assume their just proportion, for surely they are as vitally interested in conservation of forest resources as are the people who live in a county or combination of counties comprising a national forest.

The person or concern contemplating building in New York, Washington, or San Francisco, on the farms of the Middle West, or in the Prairie States must have timber; his interest in that respect lies in our national forests, yet the community in which he lives is not restricted, as are the counties in which the forests are located, because of the fact that all lands and resources outside the forests are open to entry and when located are subject to taxation.

The forest counties have been cut in two, so far as taxation is concerned, for the benefit of all the people of the United States. All must look to these forests for material for their factories and shops, and, if they carry out their building program, they must have timber, they must have box stuff for their orchards, and must look to these forests for electricity for lights and power and for water for domestic and irrigation purposes and also for the protection of navigable streams. The forest counties perform all police duties, furnish the courts, finance the prosecution of all persons committing crime within the forests, must construct roads, build bridges, erect and maintain schools within the forests. Why, then, are not the forest counties entitled to a just and adequate reimbursement when their resources have been taken from them by national legislation to be enjoyed by the people of the entire Nation?

Hundreds of thousands of acres of standing timber in the United States are being cut each year, and annually the person or concern owning the lands so cut over furnishes to the county assessor description of the lands from which the timber has been removed and they are allowed a reduction in assessed valuation. In Eldorado County privately owned lands with the timber standing thereon are assessed at \$20 per acre valuation, and when the timber is removed therefrom a valuation of \$3 is placed thereon for assessment purposes, which is a reduction of \$17 per acre valuation on each acre so cut over, and a similar reduction is made in all other forest counties, so you see it means decreased valuation of privately owned lands within the forests and increased valuation on property outside of the forests to produce revenue sufficient to meet the needs of county government, and in the course of probably 50 years the counties will be "holding the sack," so to speak, unless remedy is forthcoming.

The \$146,599,866 valuation of timber and forage resources of this State, as fixed by the bureau of public roads, was made for the purpose of determining what each county in which there are national forests is entitled to for road building. I believe this to be a just and equitable valuation on which reimbursement to the counties should be made. The 39 counties of this State would then receive approximately \$3,000,000 annually to be divided among them, according to valuation within their borders, instead of \$132,406 as in 1921 and \$157,000 as in 1922. Oregon would receive a sum proportionate to the high forest valuation within that State.

Under this method the Federal Government would be paying annually a sum approximating \$20,000,000 and dividing the same according to forest values among the several States in which national forests lie. This sum would be nearing a just and equitable reimbursement, and if the Raker bill were the law the above examples would be brought about and the Federal Government would retain for its own use the revenues derived from all sources within the forests, and the counties, when preparing annual budgets, would then have a basis on which to figure.

I am convinced that the Federal Government should acquire, either by purchase or under the provisions of the exchange bills, all cut-over lands within the present forests and allow them to reforest. I realize that under present conditions this can not be done by private owners, excepting at a financial loss which the private owner is not prepared to face, due to the heavy rate of taxation and because he does not expect to share in the ultimate returns after reforestation. This burden of expense should be borne by the public, title and products vested in the public, and the public securing the benefits of the ultimate returns.

In regard to the extension of the boundaries of the present forests, there is a strip approximating 10 miles in width along the entire west side of the pine forests of California extending from the Oregon line to Tahachipi, most of which has been cut over and is potentially fitted for timber culture; in the neighborhood of 5,000,000 acres in California could be added to the present forests, and the same is true in many of the other States. However, before the extension of the boundaries and the Government acquiring ownership to the lands provision should be made to justly compensate the counties for the loss of revenue they would sustain.

There are some who advocate that forest returns be divided among the counties on an acreage basis instead of giving credit to the county in which the particular sale happens to be made. I do not believe it would be fair to expect the forest counties of Washington, Oregon, and California, where much of the merchantable timber is now standing, to

be compelled to accept the same amount per acre as Nevada, Utah, or Idaho and other States, where the forest acreage is large and the timber is not so plentiful or valuable.

For the purpose of the following comparisons I will use the figures of the United States Bureau of Public Roads on values in counties of California, which will clearly show the injustice of the acreage basis.

Shasta County has 549,806 forest acres, valued at \$3,637,611. Ventura County has 550,885 acres, valued at \$709,694. In other words, one forest acre in Shasta County is valued at more than five times the value of an acre in Ventura County. Ventura has a larger acreage, yet it has a \$3,000,000 less value.

Butte County has 107,829 forest acres, valued at \$2,537,740, or \$23.53 per acre. Would it be just to compel Butte County to share this valuation with Los Angeles County, which has 664,958 forest acres valued at \$1,419,825, or \$2.20 per acre, one acre in Butte County being valued at more than 10 acres in Los Angeles County, and Los Angeles County has six times the number of forest acres as there are in Butte County.

Lassen County has 557,766 acres, valued at \$6,791,569, or \$11.75 per acre. Santa Barbara County has 626,876 acres valued at \$1.28 per acre.

Sierra County has a valuation of \$23.20 per acre.

San Diego County a valuation of \$1.24 per acre.

Calaveras County has a forest value of \$23.65 per acre.

Orange County a valuation of \$1.24 per acre.

Plumas has a value per acre of \$18.36.

Riverside, \$1.33 per acre.

Tehama, \$20.16 per acre.

Inyo, \$2.30 per acre.

Federal, State, city, and county governments levy on assessed or appraised valuations and collect all revenue on valuations. Acres in counties vary in valuation the same as forest acres vary in value, and I submit that it would be just as fair for the State of California to pass legislation forcing San Francisco to divide revenue it receives from taxation in that county and share the same with Alpine and other counties of this State as it would be for the Federal Government to pass laws compelling forest counties to share forest resources with counties having a lesser value and with counties which may never have stumpage sales to share.

During the hearings had by the Select Committee of the Senate on Reforestation in 1923 and 1924 many of the witnesses appearing before said committee gave their opinion that some method should be devised so as to reimburse the counties in which such national forests were located. An extract of a few of such statements is as follows:

PLACERVILLE, CALIF., February 7, 1924.

HON. JOHN E. RAKER,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE: I am inclosing you some matter taken from the record of the hearings held by the Select Committee of the Senate on Reforestation. The hearings are filled with statements such as the inclosed, and what I am sending is just one picked here and there to show you the general trend on the question of taxation.

I have read the hearings carefully and find that in the Southern States, the Pacific States (excepting only the redwood district of the Pacific States), Idaho, Montana, the Lake States, etc., that the evidence is to the effect that reforestation, in so far as the individual owner is concerned, is out of the question, due to the taxation problem.

If there is anything further I can do, please let me know. I will be glad to get part 7 of the hearings, as I do want to see the statement of Mr. John W. Blodgett, whom I understand is to have a statement in that number.

With kind personal regards, I remain,

Very truly yours,

C. E. HAND.

Excerpts from statement of Mr. Langdon C. Bell, of the committee on forestry of the Hardwood Manufacturers' Institute. The institute is one of 14 associations of lumber manufacturers and timber owners of the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association.

Who uses the lumber, who is to be benefited by, and who should bear the burden of the expense of a forestry program?

Part 2, page 224:

"We are told by those who ought to know that at the present time there are only 15 timber-exporting States. This means that there are only 15 States producing a greater quantity of lumber than they use. The figures are for all woods.

"We are told that in less than 10 years there will be only five States exporting lumber.

"There are now, we are told, 33 States that are dependent for their timber supply upon other States of the Union.

"Pennsylvania imports four-fifths of its timber; Iowa nine-tenths of the timber it uses.

"The people who live in the 33 timber-importing States include more than three-fourths of the population of the United States. It is claimed that within 10 years the people residing in the timber-importing States will comprise 95 per cent of the entire population of the United States.

"Under these circumstances can there be any doubt about the fact that the forestry problem is a national problem, the expense and burden and risk of which should be borne by the people as a whole?

"Hardwood-lumber manufacturers are entirely in sympathy with the thought that an adequate forestry program should be made effective; as citizens and taxpayers they are willing to carry their fair share of the burden and expense thereof, but they are unwilling for the burden and expense thereof to be placed upon the lumber industry.

"They hold that the hardwood manufacturers should be no more burdened with the cost of such measures than the man who buys the lumber from them and puts it into flooring, interior trim, or furniture, or the man who owns a house in which the wood is used, or the man who lives in it."

From statement of Mr. Carl M. Stevens, of the firm of Mason & Stevens, professional foresters, Portland, Oreg.:

"Mr. STEVENS. Here in the Pacific Northwest we have a very large acreage of timbered land owned by the Federal Government. In approaching this forest problem from the point of view of the private owner we immediately come up against the possible competition from that ownership. We believe that the Federal Government should bear like burdens and do the same kind of business that we will be obliged to do. If they are, we see the solution of a great many problems which now look almost insurmountable.

"A private owner who goes into the business of reforestation will have to sell on the same market that the Government itself sells on. If the Federal Government's legislative branch should instruct its Forest Service to do the same kind of business, to bear the same kind of burden, and to produce a comparable profit as compared to our properties, then there would be no question on the part of, I think, a very large number of the owners in this territory as to what they shall do with their cut-over lands.

"Colonel GREELEY. I would like to get your idea on that a little more specifically, Mr. Stevens. You speak of the Federal Government bearing the same burden.

"Mr. STEVENS. I mean simply this, Colonel Greeley: That, for instance, in one of the properties I am now studying I came up against a national forest. That county has something like 300,000 acres of nationally owned land and an estimate made by the Forest Service of somewhere nearly 8,000,000,000 feet. The people for whom I am working have an acreage very much less than that. I haven't either the Federal or the private figures at hand with me now, but I am absolutely confident that the contribution which has been made to the local community so far by the Forest Service has been practically negligible compared to the support which the private timber has been obliged to furnish.

"Senator MOSES. You mean that the amount of revenue from the national forests that has been paid and the county has received is not comparable to the amount of taxes paid by your client?

"Mr. STEVENS. I would put it this way, Senator MOSES: The problem with these properties out here and with these counties out here is the problem of financing this period after the virgin crop is removed to the time when the second crop will come in, and I mean as a matter of broad policy that if the Federal Government chooses to go into the business of producing wood crops unless they want to assume the whole burden they ought to go into the business of producing wood crops on a footing exactly similar to that in which private companies will have to go into the same business and in order that they can conduct the business in the same way, bear an equivalent burden, and sell on the same basis. In other words, if the Federal Government now owns two-thirds of the acreage and timber in a State or a county and they expect the other one-third owned by private owners to go into the same business, certainly, it seems to me, it is no more than reasonable for the Federal Government to instruct its manager of its estate to do business in exactly the same way." (Part 5, p. 739.)

From statement of Mr. Roscoe Haines, Anaconda Copper Co., Bonner, Mont.:

"The CHAIRMAN (Senator McNary). Well, wouldn't that all suggest more seriously that if you should take that land out of private ownership and place it in Government ownership your taxes would be higher?

"Mr. HAINES. They might, but the tendency is to increase the valuations all the time. If they don't get it in one place, they will get it some place else. They have so much revenue to raise; and some of the counties are in the position where they are absolutely dependent on the standing timber for a considerable por-

tion of their revenue, amounting to, between the railroads and the timber, as much as 95 per cent in individual counties.

"* * * but some of the counties are even now getting into a position where they don't know what they are going to do." (Part 5, p. 969.)

From statement of Hon. SCOTT LEAVITT, Representative in Congress, second district, Montana:

"Mr. LEAVITT. That raises the question of the sources of money for carrying on the expense of the counties; and I wonder along that line whether this has been considered: The lumbermen, I think, are holding on as has been testified here to-day to their cut-over lands, to some extent, because they fear that they are going to be the ones who will have to pay the taxes, anyway; and if they let go of these cut-over lands it will mean an increase in the percentage of taxes on the lands they hold that have timber on them." (Part 5, p. 989.)

From statement of Mr. Charles H. Worcester, of 19 South La Salle Street, Chicago:

"Mr. WORCESTER. Due to the local taxation situation, and the fact that there is no incentive for private enterprise to engage in the 100-year process of reforesting lands, and due to the fact that the majority of the people who own these lands would not be able to do it from a financial point of view.

"Senator COUZENS. It would be profitable for the Government but not for the individual?

"Mr. WORCESTER. I do not know that it would be profitable for the Government. It is not a question of profits. The thing has to be dealt with and viewed as an altruistic proposition which the people of the United States have to contribute to for their own benefit.

"Senator FLETCHER. Do you think it would be at a loss to the Government?

"Mr. WORCESTER. It has to be done more in some sections of the country than in others, but the whole people of the United States use so much timber per capita every year and it would seem as if it was necessary in the future for the Government to do something to provide for those needs.

"Senator FLETCHER. Do you mean that the Government might reasonably expect to come out even on such a venture?

"Mr. WORCESTER. I should think so." (Part 4, p. 520.)

Excerpts from letter of President Warren G. Harding to Hon. JOHN D. CLARKE, Member of Congress. Date of letter January 24, 1923. Subject: Proposed Federal forestry bill introduced by Mr. CLARKE:

"No matter how generously the Federal and State Governments may appropriate to create forest reserves or to protect forest lands from fire, private interests should be given every encouragement to do their full share in growing timber, and one of the most effective forms of encouragement is an appropriate liberalization of taxation.

"Many years are required to grow timber of merchantable size, and there is not much inducement to landowners to incur the expense of forestation, protection, and taxes, decade after decade, in order to produce at last a timber crop which a future generation shall harvest."

Excerpts copied from statements of various parties who appeared before the Select Committee of the United States Senate on Reforestation.

Personnel of committee: CHARLES L. McNARY (chairman), GEORGE H. MOSES, JAMES COUZENS, DUNCAN U. FLETCHER, PAT HARRISON. Washington, D. C., hearing, Wednesday, March 7, 1923:

Excerpts from statement of Hon. Henry C. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture:

"The problem of providing adequate revenues for counties whose taxable resource is chiefly forest lands, during the interval when a crop is being grown, has not yet been solved." (Hearings, part 1, p. 6.)

"Twenty-eight States are now importers of timber, and the whole Nation will benefit from the increased production of timber at any point, and (2) the protection of denuded and cut-over areas which will yield no commercial products for many years is of greater moment to the public than to the owner of the land." (Part 1, p. 8.)

"Adjustment of forest taxation: In securing general and sustained timber growth on private lands the adjustment of taxes to the long-time nature of timber crops probably ranks second in importance to fire protection." (Part 1, p. 17.)

"Senator FLETCHER. There might be something in that. But while the public welfare requires that our forests should be maintained and developed, the question in my mind is whether you will ever get it by depending on private enterprise, because the profits are not there; it is not to the individual's advantage to wait so long for the results, and the returns to come from the growing of timber. It seems to me it is a public inter-

est that must be subserved, and the public must take an interest and contribute some way; must engage in some active effort." (Part 1, p. 21.)

Excerpts from statement of Mr. Hugh P. Baker, representing the American Paper & Pulp Association and National Forest Programme Committee:

"I believe that wrong taxing has wiped out more forests in this country than all of the furniture industry has wiped out in this country."

"Chairman McNARY. Now, you have spoken of the tax problem, and that subject interests me greatly. It is one of our problems. You say no tax is collected while the timber is growing, but when it is cut there is a tax as high as 40 per cent of the purchase price which goes to the Government?"

Mr. Baker answering Senator McNARY as follows:

"There is a low land tax, just as we tax our agriculture a low land tax, and then there is a constant land tax, but very low. And then when the timber is cut there is a yield or severance tax, which in some cases has run as high as 45 per cent." (Pt. 1, pp. 30-31.)

Thursday, March 8, 1923:

Excerpts from statement of Mr. Wilson Compton, secretary and manager of the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, Washington, D. C.:

"Provision may well be made to reimburse local taxing units from the returns from such Government-acquired lands or otherwise for the loss of taxes involved." (Pt. 1, p. 52.)

"If the public is to expect earnest, successful effort by forest industry to perpetuate itself and its resources, there must be an equally sympathetic and helpful attitude toward the problem of the industry exhibited in all contacts with it by the public and by governmental agencies of whatever character. A successful forest policy means more than tree growing." (Pt. 1, p. 52.)

Statement of Col. W. B. Greeley, Chief Forester of the United States:

"Senator COUZENS. Then it all goes back to what was developed in our trip South; that the reforestation depends on taxation and fire, does it not?"

"Mr. GREELEY. Those are the two main things; yes, sir." (Pt. 3, p. 289.)

"Congressman LEAVITT. Yes. Of course, this exchange idea appeals to me very much. I believe that as far as the Government and the timber owners are concerned, that is the way out; but that doesn't meet, in my mind, the taxation question. The objection to this exchange is going to come from counties like Flathead, where their source of tax revenue will be cut off. That is where I have heard such talk—in western Montana."

"Colonel GREELEY. They lose, both going and coming, the tax on the private land and the 25 per cent of the value of the timber that is given in exchange—the 25 per cent they would get." (Pt. 5, p. 990.)

"Mr. GREELEY. The point here is that there has got to be a great deal of study and hard work given to the devising of forest tax laws that are effective from both standpoints—the standpoint of taxing growing timber in a reasonable way and also from the standpoint of giving the counties and townships the current revenue they need. It is not a proposition that is going to be worked out overnight. It is going to take a great many years to work it out. And obviously it is something that has got to be worked out and put into effect through State legislation."

"Senator HARRISON. Well, what, if anything, can the Federal Government do along that line?"

"Mr. GREELEY. I think that the Federal Government can do a great deal to assist the States by conducting investigations, modeling tax laws, etc."

"Senator HARRISON. You would not do it through the enactment of any law; that is, you would not make it a condition of an appropriation?"

"Colonel GREELEY. I do not favor that, Senator. I will come to that in just a moment."

"The CHAIRMAN (Senator McNARY). Pardon me, but before you leave that question of taxation: I can conceive that great hardships will follow such a scheme as a severance tax in counties where there is a heavy forested area." (Pt. 3, p. 317.)

"Mr. GREELEY. Now, that is one of the things I have chiefly in mind in saying that the forest-taxation problem is not a single problem and it is not going to be quickly solved. Before it can be solved you have got to meet the needs of the local political unit for stable revenue, just as well as the needs of the timber owner for some adjustments in taxing his property." (Pt. 3, p. 319.)

"Senator HARRISON. Of course in the West, as I understand, the Government owns great quantities of land that they are not paying any taxes on. Naturally that makes a lot of those counties poor. But in the South that does not exist." (Pt. 3, p. 319.)

"The CHAIRMAN (Senator McNARY). The thought suggested by Senator HARRISON—and it runs through the record—is that 75

per cent of the problem of reforestation is fire protection. You may protect your forests all right from fire, but you are not going to get anyone to take an interest in it and give it that moral support which is necessary to make it a success unless you do get a satisfactory tax law applicable to private property."

"If you were protecting my piece of land from fire, it would not necessarily interest me in reforestation, unless I could satisfactorily adjust that property so far as taxation is concerned." (Pt. 3, p. 319.)

"Senator COUZENS. It seems to me that the questions of taxation and fire protection are so interwoven that they can not be segregated; and if we are to invite or urge or help private capital to reforest, we have got to combine the two. I do not see how you can get away from it. It seems to me that any other way is wasteful."

"Mr. GREELEY. Well, there is no question about their being closely interwoven. The only question in my mind is which method will bring the most rapid progress."

"Senator COUZENS. All of the testimony we took in the South, with a few exceptions, indicate that no private owner of timberland would undertake under any circumstances to grow forests unless he was assured of what the ultimate cost would be over a period of, say, 30 or 40 years. Is that not correct? Was not that the general trend of the testimony?"

"Mr. GREELEY. You will find particularly among the large timber companies frequently an expression of opinion that they can not go into it until the tax uncertainty is settled." (Pt. 3, p. 322.)

"Senator McNARY. One of the greatest grievances of the western people of which I know—and I was born there and know whereof I speak on the subject—has been the great areas that the Government ties up and keeps away from development; and naturally you find people rebelling against keeping it off the tax rolls." (Pt. 4, p. 465.)

"Gov. LOUIS F. HART, of the State of Washington. If the Federal Government enters into a program of reforestation independent of the State government, it likewise means adding a considerable area to the Federally owned and controlled lands in this State and taking from the State tax rolls without any corresponding recompense to the State for such protection as it may give."

"Already one-third of the area of this State is in Government reserves, and as long as the burden of local government includes the protection of logged-off lands some arrangement should be made by which the State could be reimbursed for such expenditure without placing an unnecessary burden on the already heavily tax-ridden property of the State."

"Some 20 years or more ago many thousands of acres of our best timberland were set aside into forest reserves for the benefit of future generations. At that time I was unable to understand just what that meant, but as I see billions of feet of the timber on these reserves being sold at low prices and on long time, perpetually keeping them off the tax rolls, I appear to be getting a gleam of light."

"I desire to enter the emphatic protest of this State against the further extension of the principle embodied in the act of Congress of March 20, 1922, whereby the valuable timber of the forest reserves will be traded for logged-off lands neither fit for reforestation or pasturage, and these embraced within the forest reserves, and still further increase the area of nontaxable land." (Pt. 5, p. 804.)

From statement of Mr. F. E. Pape, State supervisor of forestry, Olympia, Wash.:

"The CHAIRMAN (Senator McNARY). What might Congress do in aiding you in the protection of your forests?"

"Mr. PAPE. The appropriation should be very largely increased on the basis that Congress is figuring on now which I think is purely an aid proposition, but I think they ought to reach the correct basis on this: That the Government should contribute on its holdings here on about the same basis as private individuals would pay if they were contributing to the support of the State government."

"Colonel GREELEY. Well, the Government is doing that now isn't it, Mr. Pape?"

"Mr. PAPE. In a very small way."

"Colonel GREELEY. We are protecting the national forests if that is what you mean."

"Mr. PAPE. You are protecting the national forests, but what about all of this other area that is going off our tax rolls year after year? And I say if the Government is going to say to the State of Washington, 'we want you to grow timber,' then they should come in and contribute their share." (Pt. 5, p. 826.)

"Mr. PAPE. Now, if you are going to say to the State, 'You shall keep 95 per cent or 80 per cent, whatever it is in this State growing timber,' and all of this is going back to your Eastern

States to supply your population in the East with lumber, why should the State of Washington be required to put up money year after year in growing these forests without some aid from the Federal Government? That is the view I take of it.

"Senator MOSES. It is not in the power of the Federal Government to demand that, Mr. Pape.

"Mr. PAPE. Well, it might not be in the power of the State to do these things, either; but if you want it done, somebody has got to pay the bill."

Mr. George S. Long, lumber and timber business. (Mr. Long's taxes for the year 1922 amounted to \$583,490.) Address at Tacoma, Wash.:

"Mr. LONG. Well, it is an old story, and I can't put any new angles to it except to say that it is a question of taxation and carrying charges. Now, I am talking about that which this hearing is called for in this district, the Douglas fir district; for we face a condition out here, not a theory, an absolute condition, and that pertains to taxation.

"Keeping fire out simply solves the problem that timber will grow. It does not solve the economical problem of growing timber at a profit, and that is what you have got to solve if you ask private individuals to do it." (Pt. 5, p. 838.)

"Mr. LONG. That is what these forests are for; they are for everybody. That is the reason you are talking about growing it. It is to supply the future needs of our own countrymen. It is a public stunt; it is a public effort; it is no more the duty of the lumberman than it is of the dentist. You are growing a forest for posterity; for the public, and the public should pay the bill.

"Senator MOSES. Of course, the most popular tax in the world is the one that the other man pays.

"Mr. LONG. Yes; that is what I mean, and if we are to take part in this growing of a new forest by everybody contributing a mite to it it might be popular; I don't know. But if that were done everybody would have an interest in it, but I think that it is one of the things that is very, very largely the public's question; the public's interest; the public's duty.

"I would not enter upon the game of reforestation at all, Colonel Greeley, if they didn't fix the tax question first. Then when you fix that I will divide the other expense any old way you want to. If you will take care of the tax question, I will take care of all of them. So far as the Weyerhaeuser Timber Co.'s costs are concerned, I won't ask you to divide it at all. We will take care of all of it ourselves if you will take care of the tax question.

"Colonel GREELEY. You see I am working from the opposite standpoint. Let us take care of the fire protection and let you take care of the tax proposition.

"Mr. LONG. I know that is the favorite stunt, as I just told you. You see the tax figures there [indicating tax statement filed by Mr. Long]. That is my position there. No; I don't think that we want to get an eclipse over our eyes because of this nice, beautiful theory that all we have to do is to keep the fire out of the timber. That is 'fine stuff,' and it is right that the timber will grow; while that will take care of the physical question, yet you have questions more vital than the physical question in this game.

"Colonel GREELEY. My position is simply this, Mr. Long: I appreciate the importance of the tax situation fully; at the same time I don't believe, taking the western forestry districts by and large, that the present or probable taxation of cut-over land is nearly as large an obstacle as you seem to view it.

"Mr. LONG. Well, are you talking about to-day?

"Colonel GREELEY. Yes, sir.

"Mr. LONG. I am talking about to-morrow, the next day, 5 years from now, 10 years from now, 20 years from now, 30 years from now, when during all of that period I can't withdraw from that property one single cent of revenue. I have got to pay the taxes every year, every year, every year, for 30 or 40 or 50 or 60 years; and I have got to take all the ups and downs that represent public whims about taxation—such a 'blind alley' that no man with one grain of common sense would ever start without some kind of a flash light to at least tell him where he must get off. That is the proposition. You are jumping into the unknown, absolutely the unknown, except as the past has told the story, and there is a record of the past in taxation matters.

"Colonel GREELEY. You anticipate a proportionate rise of taxation on cut-over lands?

"Mr. LONG. As soon as they come to have a value, Colonel Greeley; yes; sure. What else can they do? What else can they do? What would the necessities of public sentiment do to the Weyerhaeuser Timber Co. if we had 100,000 acres of second-growth timber out here 25 years old, or 20 years old? They would say, 'Well, now, in about 10 or 15 years more that is going to be worth \$100 an acre, so it is worth \$50 an acre now.' You could not stop that any more than you could the tides of the ocean, so far as taxation is concerned, or any other matter; and you should

realize that sentiment if you want private citizens to engage in the business of growing forests under existing tax laws." (Part 5, pp. 843-844.)

From statement of Hon. Alex Polson, State senator, logger, and manufacturer, Hoquiam, Wash.:

"We can't carry it and pay the taxes, because by and by it will commence to produce forests, and the tax assessor will think they are valuable and begin to assess them at high values that will confiscate them. We will have to have some relief from taxes when that time comes or get out of the business.

"Senator FLETCHER. You have your forest-fire protection system better organized now?

"Mr. POLSON. We can protect the forests against everything except taxes, and we would like to have you help on that. On everything else, I think, we are equal to the occasion—everything except taxes. If you can help us out on the tax problem we certainly will appreciate it.

"Mr. POLSON. You will have plenty of timber in the East if you will take some interest in the reforestation of it. I do claim that in all of these five States we are entitled to all of the revenue from the forests and the mines and everything in our States, just the same as the eastern man had. With all due respects to Governor Pinchot, his fortune was left to him by his forefathers, who made it out of the natural resources of the eastern country." (Part 5, p. 866.)

From statement of Mr. J. J. Donovan, Bloedel-Donovan Lumber Co., Bellingham, Wash.:

"Mr. DONOVAN. Now, in this western country, or the five States that are timber-producing States, a statement has been prepared and has been or will be submitted to you in print—I believe it is already before you—showing that about two-thirds of the entire timbered area of these five States is owned by the State or the Nation, and that about one-half of all of the merchantable timber of these five States is on that two-thirds area." (Part 5, p. 858.)

"The Western States, with their forests, were not treated exactly right in having such a large portion of their area reserved to the National Government as compared with the Eastern States, and therefore we rather resent the Eastern States telling us just what we should do with these forests and taking all of the money away and spending it somewhere else." (Part 5, p. 860.)

From statement of Hon. Nathan Eckstein, member of the State tax investigation committee of the State of Washington:

"I think, first of all, the Federal Government should give the State full return for the national forests which the Government owns, and that is not being done. It must be realized that we are one of 48 States. The rest of the country had all of the land given the individual owners, and is now on the tax rolls.

"If the Federal Government had not kept the land, we would have it on the tax rolls now and would get a revenue from it." (Part 5, p. 857.)

From statement of Mr. William C. Butler, Lyman Timber Co., Everett, Wash.:

"Mr. BUTLER. I think if the State was properly supported by the Nation, under the distinct program that you were building or you were growing a forest for the public at large, then I think the county would do anything, provided they got some financial assistance. They must have some financial assistance, because they have got all of these improvements which you have heard described; they have got these obligations and they must get something on the tax rolls or must get contributions or taxes from some source." (Part 5, p. 853.)

From Mr. Mark E. Reed, logger, Shelton, Wash.:

"Well, I think, as Mr. Long does, that the greatest problem we have to face is taxation. If there is any way by which the National Government could make a contribution direct out of the forest reserve sales to the State to be apportioned back to the counties, the several counties of the State, irrespective of the reforestation problem in the meantime, we might be able, where the people of these counties saw some real money coming back from the Government, to reimburse them * * * there has got to be something to offset the prejudice they have that a reduction of values of land for reforestation purposes will not increase their taxes." (Part 5, p. 851.)

From statement of M. L. T. Murray, West Fork Timber Co., Tacoma, Wash.:

"Senator FLETCHER. You want a portion of that tax to go to the counties and not all to the State?

"Mr. MURRAY. Of course something would have to be worked out to take care of the counties that would naturally lose from any such system (referring to reforestation).

"The CHAIRMAN (Senator McNARY). Is it your opinion that the increase in the value of stumpage would absorb the item of taxes over a period of years?

"Mr. MURRAY. I could not answer that question, Senator, because that is looking into the dim future. I would not want to take a chance, personally, on it." (Part 5, p. 833.)

Mr. John S. Bradley, of the Bradley Logging Co.:

"Mr. BRADLEY. I give my opinion as to the problem of reforestation. I am convinced that this can not be successfully accomplished by the private owner alone. The annual menace of forest fires, over which he has very little control, practically forbids the attempt; besides, the excessive cost of interest and taxes levied annually upon his holdings urge upon him the necessity of harvesting his crop as rapidly as possible." (Part 5, p. 800.)

From statement of Mr. A. W. Laird, of Potlatch, Idaho, president of Western Forestry & Conservation Association, president of the North Idaho Forestry Association, and president of the Potlatch Timber Protective Association:

"Senator McNARY. Government increase of fire protection, would that be inducement sufficiently for timbermen privately to reforest?"

"Mr. LAIRD. Not without relief from taxation.

"The CHAIRMAN. Yes; so there are two factors?

"Mr. LAIRD. Yes, sir; they are important ones. You see, Idaho has a very large part of its domain in the national forest reserves and is a State with only 400,000 people in it, so the tax burden on the people who have property, who have to pay taxes, is quite a considerable bill.

"The CHAIRMAN. The extent of the Government's holding in Idaho is 69 per cent or greater.

"Senator FLETCHER. Mr. Laird, you might consider this thought in connection with the demand for relief from taxation on cut-over lands: Whether you want to delay until you can get the State to say that they will not tax cut-over lands at all for a period of years, or only nominally, as you suggest the counties must have some money, some income, in order to pay their expenses. Now, if they relieve cut-over lands from taxation, won't they have to make it up by increasing the tax on your timberland; so that in the end you would not save so much after all?" (Pt. 5, p. 890.)

From statement of Mr. C. L. Billings, land agent of Edward Rutledge Timber Co., Coeur d'Alene, Idaho:

"Mr. BILLINGS. In discussing whether or not we can cut down taxes on cut-over land I just want to leave this impression with you gentlemen. It is obvious to all of us that, having certain bills to meet, you have to have the valuation to assess your levy against to reach it, to meet them. So long as we live here—that is, so long as the timber industry lives here and pays taxes—we can take it for granted, no matter what kind of tax reform is put in, if you take taxable property off the tax rolls and put it in either Federal or State ownership, the burden of taxation has got to remain on what you have left. We will get our share of that increase, and that tax will be directly in proportion to the tax that we are already paying." (Pt. 5, p. 907.)

From statement of Mr. H. G. Miller, president Kalispell Lumber Co., Kalispell, Mont.:

"Senator McNARY. Well, assume that you remove the trees and it takes a hundred years to grow a new crop, and that the Government and the State owned the land; how are you going to support your county and State governments during that period?

"Mr. MILLER. When the county authorities come to that bridge they will find a way to cross it, and they will make up that deficit in their budget by putting the tax on the industry—the logging and the lumbering.

"At the present time I will tell you what would practically take effect. If the process of the lands passing into the hands of the Federal Government takes place, it will create a deficit in county finances. The deficit will be made good by a direct tax, in my opinion—by a direct tax on logs and lumber products. In relieving the industry of these taxes you are simply going around the block and coming back, and will depend on the same people for the same tax." (Pt. 5, p. 951.)

From statement of Judge Marvin E. Rosenberry, judge of the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin:

"Judge ROSENBERY. The first proposition to be considered is the matter of taxation. Speaking from the standpoint of towns, villages, and counties, and particularly where the State has acquired large areas, they find it very difficult to adjust their local requirements to the matter of taxation. * * * As a proposition otherwise than acquiring the property outright by either the State or the Federal Government it seems to me the fundamental problem relates to taxation." (Pt. 4, p. 558.)

Statement of John W. Blodgett, president of the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, Grand Rapids, Mich.:

"The CHAIRMAN. Do you want the private owners to go out of the forestry business and turn it over to the Government?

"Mr. BLODGETT. I have been reluctantly driven by quite a survey of the situation to the conclusion that only by such action on the part of the Federal Government will we get anywhere.

"I hope that the committee will not lose sight of this one fundamental fact: That whenever economic conditions warrant individual operation and initiative you can rely upon the American business man to step into that breach just at the very first moment, and then the function and the duty of the Government will cease so far as buying large tracts of land is concerned, but that time is so far in the future and the necessity of action is so imminent that we are up against the other proposition."

I wrote the following letter to each State forester, inquiring what provision the States had made for such reimbursement when the State owned forest lands:

Hon. _____,

State Forester, _____.

In re: Taxation—State-owned forests.

MY DEAR SIR: Would you kindly advise me what provisions, if any, have been made by your State relative to reimbursement for taxes lost by the State by reason of State-owned forests? In other words, has your State made any provision for the State and county reimbursement by reason of loss of taxes when the State has obtained and now owns forest lands which are not subject to direct taxation as privately owned lands?

If it would be convenient for you to furnish me copy of such laws or synopsis and citation thereof, I would appreciate it very much. Kindly send same to my address, Room 292, House Office Building, Washington, D. C. I am,

Yours most truly,

JOHN E. RAKER, M. C.

The States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Michigan, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Vermont, and New York replied, showing that the State provided a tax against State forest lands, which is turned over to the counties, townships, or cities in which the State forest land is located.

These letters are as follows:

PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF FORESTS AND WATERS,

Harrisburg, January 29, 1924.

Hon. JOHN E. RAKER, M. C.

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RAKER: Your letter of January 19 and copies of House and Senate bills Nos. 148 and 1553 are received.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania made the first purchase of State forest land in 1898. Additional tracts were added from time to time, and the State forests now comprise 1,130,516 acres.

It was necessary to reimburse townships wherein State lands were located so that they would not be entirely deprived of taxes from these tracts. With this in view, acts were passed providing a fixed annual charge of 5 cents per acre on all State forest land.

The auxiliary forest reserve laws, which were passed in 1913, provide a separate classification for privately owned timberlands. Lands so classified are assessed at not more than \$1 per acre. A fixed annual charge of 4 cents per acre for school and road purposes is paid by the Department of Forests and Waters to townships wherein auxiliary forest reserves are located. As a rule, timberlands in Pennsylvania are not assessed unreasonably high, and to date but 26,213 acres have been placed in this class.

Copies of the laws authorizing the purchase of State forest land, the payment of fixed charges on timberlands for school, road, and county purposes, and the classification of auxiliary forest reserves are attached.

Sincerely yours,

R. Y. STUART,
Secretary.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,

DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT,

Trenton, March 13, 1924.

Hon. JOHN E. RAKER,

Member House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am sorry to have been rather tardy in replying to your inquiry of March 3 relative to forest taxation. I am inclosing a copy of the latest printed edition of our forestry laws. This booklet is now in process of revision. However, the provision dealing with forest taxation, as given in section 6, chapter 47, P. L. 1905, on page 7, and chapter 214, P. L. 1908, given on page 10, will give you the text of the legislation as it now stands in connection with the tax situation on State-owned forest land.

There is no exemption from taxation or any tax preference on forest land in New Jersey aside from this provision for State forest property.

DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT.

C. P. WILBER, State Forester.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION,
Lansing, March 8, 1924.

HON. JOHN E. RAKER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of March 3 is received.

Act 116, Public Acts of Michigan, 1917, provides that a flat rate of 5 cents per acre on all lands to which the State owns title shall be paid to the separate counties in which such lands are located. This is for construction and improvements of highways and is in lieu of any and all taxes assessed on State lands under previously existing statutes.

I am sorry that we can not furnish you with a copy of this law, as our supply is exhausted.

Very truly yours, MARCUS SCHAAF, State Forester.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION,
DIVISION OF FORESTRY, STATE HOUSE,
Boston, March 6, 1924.

HON. JOHN E. RAKER, M. C.,
Room 292, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your letter of March 3 regarding taxation of State-owned forests received. I inclose copy of the sections of our general laws which apply to this taxation. You will note in section 13 it is stated "in 1925," etc. This is simply an extension of the date in the new revision of our general laws, but the same operation has been taking place for a long time.

I am also inclosing a copy of our forest taxation law, which was passed two years ago, which I think will be of interest to you, to show the way we are handling the taxation of private forest lands.

If I can be of any further service to you, please let me know.

Very truly yours,

WM. A. L. BAZELEY, Commissioner.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR LOSS OF TAXES ON LAND USED FOR PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS, ETC.

[General Laws, ch. 58]

SEC. 13. In 1925 and in every fifth year thereafter the commissioner shall between April 1 and June 1 determine as of April 1 the fair cash value of all land in every town owned by the Commonwealth and used for the purposes of a public institution under the department of mental disease, the department of public welfare, or the department of correction, a fish hatchery or game preserve, a State military camp ground, or a State forest. This determination shall be in such detail as to lots, subdivisions, or acreage as the commissioner may deem necessary, and to assist him in making it he may require oral or written information from any officer or agent of the Commonwealth or of any town therein and from any other inhabitant thereof, and may require such information to be on oath. Such officers, agents, and persons, so far as able, shall furnish the commissioner with the required information in such form as he may indicate within 15 days after being so requested by him.

SEC. 14. The commissioner, under the preceding section, not later than June 10 of each year in which he makes such determination, shall notify the assessors of each town where the Commonwealth owns land for the purposes therein named of his determination of the value of such land in such town. A board of assessors aggrieved by said determination may, within 10 days after the date of the notice, apply for a correction thereof to the board of appeal from decisions of the commissioner of corporations and taxation. Said board shall give a hearing to such assessors not later than July 15 following, and shall seasonably notify them and the commissioner of the time and place of the hearing. After the hearing said board of appeal shall notify said board of assessors and the commissioner of its finding as to the value of the land in question, and its decision shall be conclusive.

SEC. 15. The valuation determined under the two preceding sections shall be in effect for the purposes of sections 13 to 17, inclusive, during the year in which such valuation is made and the four succeeding years, and until another valuation is made under said sections, except that whenever land is acquired by the Commonwealth for the purposes named in section 13 the commissioner shall adopt the assessed valuation of said land made in the year last preceding such purchase, and such assessed valuation shall be the valuation of the land for the purposes of sections 13 to 17, inclusive, until a new valuation is made by the commissioner under sections 13 and 14.

SEC. 16. In every year, not later than August 1, the commissioner shall deliver to the State treasurer a statement as to the value of land subject to sections 13 to 17, inclusive, in each town and of the amount of money to be paid to each of such towns as determined by the following section.

SEC. 17. The treasurer in every year, not later than November 15, shall reimburse each town in which the Commonwealth owns land for

the purposes named in section 13 an amount in lieu of taxes upon the value of such land as reported to him by the commissioner under the preceding section, determined by multiplying each thousand dollars of valuation or fractional part thereof by the rate provided for under section 58 of chapter 63.

[Chap. 360]

An act providing for the taxation of forest products and the classification and taxation of forest lands

Be it enacted, etc., as follows:

SECTION 1. The General Laws is hereby amended by striking out chapter 61 and inserting in place thereof the following:

CHAPTER 61

TAXATION OF FOREST PRODUCTS AND CLASSIFICATION AND TAXATION OF FOREST LANDS

SECTION 1. An owner of forest land, valued on the town-tax list of the preceding year for land and growth at not more than \$25 per acre, and which does not contain more than 20 cords per acre on the average, but which is so stocked with trees as to promise a minimum prospective average yield per acre, exclusive of water, bog, or ledge, of 20,000 board feet for softwoods or 8,000 board feet for hardwoods, or for mixtures of the two, such volume between said limits determinable by the relative percentages of the two classes of growth, may apply in writing to the town assessors to have said land listed as classified forest land, and such application shall contain a description of said land sufficiently accurate for identification.

SEC. 2. Within 30 days after the receipt of said application the assessors shall decide whether the property fulfills the requirements for classification and shall notify the owner of their decision, giving their valuation of the tract as land alone, and if within 10 days of notification the owner accepts their decision the assessors shall give him a certificate containing the name of the owner and a description of the parcel to be classified, and stating that the land described conforms to the requirements for classification under this chapter. Upon the recording of this certificate by the owner in the registry of deeds for the county or district where the land lies, the parcel shall become classified forest land. Each parcel of land so classified shall thereafter be designated in the annual valuation list of the town, in the column provided for the description of each parcel of land, as classified forest land so long as the parcel remains so classified. The valuation and tax annually assessed upon land classified under this chapter shall not include the value of forest trees growing thereon. When classified forest land is sold or otherwise changes title, the obligations and benefits of this chapter shall devolve upon the new holder of the title.

SEC. 3. The standing growth on classified forest land shall not be taxed, but the owner of such land, except as hereinafter provided, shall pay a products tax of 6 per cent of the stumpage value upon all wood or timber cut therefrom, and one-tenth of such taxes collected by the town shall be paid to the State treasurer. Trees standing on such land shall not be included in the town valuation in apportioning the State or county tax among the towns. But an owner of classified forest land may annually cut, free of tax, wood or timber from such land, not exceeding \$25 in stumpage value: *Provided*, That such wood or timber is for his own use or for that of a tenant of said land only. Buildings or other structures standing on classified forest land shall be taxed as real estate with the land on which they stand. Classified forest land shall be subject to special assessments and betterment assessments. The owner shall make a sworn return to the assessors before May 1 of each year of the amount of all wood and timber cut from such land during the year ending on the preceding April 1.

SEC. 4. When in the judgment of the assessors classified forest land contains on the average per acre 25,000 board feet for softwoods or 10,000 board feet for hardwoods, or for mixtures of the two, such volume between said limits determinable by the relative percentages of the two classes of growth, they shall notify the owner that two years from date of notification the forest products tax of 6 per cent of the value of the standing timber based on the above volumes will be levied and that the land and timber will at that time be taken from the classified list and placed in the general property tax list. Should the owner elect to reduce within two years the volume of timber below the volume mentioned in the preceding sentence the land shall remain classified; but, if at the end of five years from time of cutting, the growth stock on the tract does not meet the requirements for classification contained in section 1 the tract may be taken from classification by the assessors and any taxes due thereon collected. An owner may withdraw his land from classification at any time by the payment of the land tax and the forest products tax of 6 per cent on the estimated value of the standing timber. Within 30 days after an owner requests to withdraw his land from classification the assessors shall determine the taxes due thereon, which shall be paid before the land is taken from the classified list. When in the judgment of the assessors classified forest land becomes more valuable for other use than the production of trees they may, after 30 days' notice, withdraw said land from classification, and any taxes due thereon shall be paid at

the time of withdrawal: *Provided*, That the owner may appeal from such withdrawal to the commissioner, whose decision shall be final. Whenever land is withdrawn from classification the assessors shall record in the registry of deeds for the county or district where the land lies a certificate setting forth such withdrawal and containing reference by book and page to the record of the certificate under which said land was classified.

SEC. 5. In case of dispute as to the eligibility of land for classification or as to the volume of wood or timber contained on such land or cut therefrom, either party may appeal to the State forester, who shall examine the property and hear both parties, and whose decision shall be final.

SEC. 6. Any owner of classified forest land who fails to comply with the requirements of this chapter shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$10 nor more than \$500, and in addition to said penalty the land may be withdrawn from classification by the assessors.

SEC. 7. Notwithstanding the passage of this act, all land and the trees, wood, and timber thereon which are on the date when this act takes effect subject to the provisions of chapter 61 of the General Laws shall continue to be subject thereto in accordance therewith. (Approved May 2, 1922.)

STATE FORESTER, STATE FOREST FIRE WARDEN,
Hartford, Conn., March 5, 1924.

Mr. JOHN E. RAKER, M. C.,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RAKER: I am in receipt of your letter of the 3d, relative to forest taxation, and take pleasure in sending you a copy of our forest laws. You will see on pages 33 to 41 laws relating to taxation. The statute relative to the taxation of State forests is on page 41. We have felt from the first that if we should try to set aside State forests without providing for taxation there would be opposition on the part of the local citizens.

If there are any further questions in regard to this subject, I shall be glad to hear from you.

Yours very truly,

A. F. HAWES, State Forester.

COMMISSIONER OF FORESTRY, STATE OF VERMONT,
Montpelier, March 11, 1924.

JOHN E. RAKER, M. C.,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of March 3d in regard to taxation of State-owned forests has been received, and we are pleased to hand you copy of No. 28 of the Acts of 1919, which has to do with this subject.

If we can be of further assistance to you, we shall be glad to have you call on us.

Very truly yours,

FOREST SERVICE,
By IDA P. CALCOGNI, Secretary.

No. 28. An act to amend sections 465 and 722 of the General Laws relating to the classification of State forest reserves for tax purposes

It is hereby enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Vermont:

SECTION 1. Section 465 of the General Laws is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 465. State forests; taxation: The governor is hereby authorized, upon recommendation of said forester, to accept gifts of land to the State, the same to be held, protected, and administered as a State forest reserve. All proceeds from the sales of timber or other products from such lands shall be paid to the State treasurer and be used at the discretion of said forester in the furtherance of the forestry interests of the State. All lands held as State forest reserves shall be appraised under the provisions of section 722 of the general laws and set to the State in the grand list of the town where located, and the State shall pay taxes thereon."

SEC. 2. Section 722 of the General Laws is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 722. Young timberlands; classification; special tax: Land fully stocked with forest trees not more than 15 years old, except scattered trees the presence of which does not increase the assessed value of the property; land incompletely or partially stocked with forest trees not more than 15 years old, when planted with a sufficient number of additional trees to assure a spacing of approximately 6 by 6 feet over the entire area; lands held as State forest reserves, and open land planted with not less than 1,000 forest trees to the acre, shall be classified as forest land: *Provided*, In each case that the trees planted are of the following species: Ash, basswood, oak, maple; white, Scotch,

or Norway pine; European larch, white or Norway spruce, or any other species approved by the State forester: *And provided further*, That said forester approves the manner in which the trees are planted: *And provided further*, That such land is outside the limits of a city or village. Land so classified shall thereafter be taxed annually under the general tax law at the local rate on a valuation of the land alone, such valuation to be established by the listers at the time of classification, in no case to exceed \$3 an acre, and such valuation shall be maintained until the year 1950. In such year the land alone shall be revalued without regard to the above limit, and the valuation then established shall be maintained for a further period of 50 years, taxes being levied annually under the general tax law on such valuation at the local rate. Whenever a commercial cutting is made, the owner of the timber shall pay a special tax on the gross stumpage value of the amount cut, which is hereby assessed at 10 per cent of such value."

STATE OF NEW YORK,
CONSERVATION COMMISSION,
Albany, March 5, 1924.

HON. JOHN E. RAKER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are in receipt of your letter of March 3, 1924, relative to taxation of State lands of the forest preserve.

The forest preserve was created by chapter 283 of the Laws of 1885. The lands were at that time exempt from taxation. The next year provision was made for the payment of taxes on said lands by chapter 280 of the Laws of 1886.

Our tax laws were codified in 1896, and provision was made therein for the taxation of forest-preserve lands by chapter 908 of the laws of that year. The provision has been changed slightly from time to time, the last amendment being chapter 650 of the Laws of 1923.

By reference to the laws mentioned we think you will obtain the information that you desire.

Very truly yours,

ALEXANDER MACDONALD, Commissioner.
By A. B. STROUGH, Land Clerk.

The States of Minnesota, Washington, Wisconsin, and Maryland are working along the line of the "Hand plan" as it affects State forest lands, as will appear from the letters of State officers of said States:

MINNESOTA STATE FOREST SERVICE,
OFFICE OF THE FORESTER,
St. Paul, March 11, 1924.

HON. JOHN E. RAKER, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have your letter of March 3. This State has not made any provision whereby townships or counties are reimbursed for taxes on account of State-owned lands. At the last session of the State legislature this department drafted a bill for reimbursing townships for the loss of taxes due to the location of State forests within their boundaries. No action was taken on this bill. For your information I am inclosing herewith a copy of the bill.

I would suggest that you get in touch with the State Forester of Pennsylvania. This State has such a law on its books, and it has been working for some time. I am sure that you will be able to get very good information from them.

Yours very truly,

G. M. CONZET,
Acting State Forester.
By ARTHUR F. OPPEL,
Supervisor of the New State Forests.

An act providing a fixed charge on lands acquired by the State for State forests, and the distribution of revenue so derived for school, road, and general revenue purposes in the townships in which they are located.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota:

SECTION 1. That from and after the passage of this act all lands now acquired or hereafter to be acquired by the State for State forests and which now are exempt from taxation shall be subject to an annual charge of 3 cents per acre for the benefit of the townships in which State forests are located, one-third of the revenue to be used for the benefit of the schools, one-third for the benefit of the roads, and one-third for general revenue purpose of the township.

SEC. 2. The State forester shall certify to the respective school districts and townships throughout the State in which State forests are located, and to the State treasurer the number of acres owned by the State therein for State forest purposes and the amount of charge in favor of each district and township. The State forester shall draw his warrant in favor of each of the treasurer of each said school district and each said township treasurer, which said warrant after the approval and counter signature of the State auditor shall be paid by

the State treasurer to the respective school districts or townships in whose favor the same may be drawn.

SEC. 3. There is hereby appropriated from the general revenue fund of the State out of any moneys not otherwise appropriated the sum of \$20,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and \$20,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, which shall be credited to the forestry board to be used therefor as provided in this act.

SEC. 4. All acts and parts of acts inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed.

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT,
Olympia, March 11, 1924.

Hon. JOHN E. RAKER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your letter of March 3 relative to taxation of State-owned forests you are advised there is no provision for reimbursements of counties on lands acquired by the State; in other words, the counties derive no taxes from State-owned lands.

We are inclosing a bill introduced in the last legislature whereby the State could automatically acquire forest lands which have reverted to the county for nonpayment of taxes, the State to administer and protect the timber on such lands until it is of commercial value. Upon the sale of the timber the State would deduct enough money to cover the cost of administration, and the balance would revert to the counties. This bill was defeated.

We are also inclosing a copy of the forest protection laws of Washington, and call particular attention to page 29, chapter 3, "Reforestation."

Yours very truly,

T. J. GOODYEAR,
Assistant State Supervisor of Forestry.

CONSERVATION COMMISSION,
STATE OF WISCONSIN,
Madison, Wis., March 7, 1924.

Hon. JOHN E. RAKER, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of the 3d received regarding the taxation of State-owned forest land.

Wisconsin has approximately 400,000 acres of public land. Of this acreage, 159,000 acres was purchased for forest reserve purposes and the bulk of it is blocked up in two counties. In our State there are no unorganized areas. Every part of the State has a town, county, and State government, and in the towns in the State land areas the percentages of State-owned land run as high as 60 per cent. This has always constituted a very serious grievance in the eyes of the local inhabitants, inasmuch as the State is barred by the uniformity laws of its constitution from returning to the towns and counties any tax money in lieu of the exemptions on lands held for forest, park, or other public purposes.

There is some effort made by the State to partially reimburse these towns by assisting in the construction of roads on these State-owned lands, but everything considered no tax money is paid back to the local governments by the State on account of the taxes lost by reason of the State owning forest or park properties. This has always been a sore spot in these communities and one of the things that has led to serious opposition to a forest program in this State. It will be necessary for a constitutional amendment to be passed before this situation can be remedied. I regret that we do not have any pamphlets that would detail this situation in a more precise way. In case you want any further information we shall be glad to be at your service.

Very truly yours,

C. L. HARRINGTON,
Superintendent of Forests and Parks.

AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE OF TEXAS,
College Station, Tex., March 11, 1924.

Hon. JOHN E. RAKER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RAKER: Your letter of March 3 is received. The last legislature appropriated a small sum for buying several thousand acres of State forest lands, and it is the intention to add to this acreage from year to year by additional purchases. The initial appropriation granted by the last legislature was in the shape of a rider to our general forestry appropriation bill and contained no reference to the payment of taxes. I have discussed the matter of taxing State forests with a number of our legislators and members of the Texas Forestry Association. The general conclusion seems to be that as our State forest acreage increases the next legislature or the one following will make provisions to have the State forests pay the local and county taxes.

Yours very sincerely,

E. O. SIECKE,
State Forester.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, STATE DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY,
Baltimore, Md., March 7, 1924.

Hon. JOHN E. RAKER,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have your letter of March 3, inquiring about provisions for reimbursing the local units for loss of taxes on State forest lands.

Under our existing laws, State-owned lands are exempt from both county and State taxes. Up to the present time we have acquired such small areas of State forest that the loss of taxes has not been considered a serious problem. We do, however, realize that if the State embarks on an acquisition policy, such as we are now advocating, it will be necessary to pay into the county revenue on such lands in lieu of the loss of taxes.

The plan we have in mind is similar to that in Pennsylvania, where the State would pay on a basis of 5 cents per acre to the county for road and school purposes on land held in State forests.

Very truly yours,

F. W. BESLEY, State Forester.

The other States replied that no provision had as yet been made for such reimbursement.

The Acting Forester, Mr. E. A. Sherman, of the United States Forest Service, furnished me with a compilation of the laws of certain States which pertain to the taxation of State-owned forests. The letter and compilation are as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Washington, February 26, 1924.

Hon. JOHN E. RAKER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. RAKER: With further reference to your letter of February 7:

I take pleasure in attaching herewith a compilation of the provisions in State laws which pertain to the taxation of State-owned forests. In supplying this, however, I wish to state that our information on the subject is not complete.

In the case of Massachusetts, for instance, we have compiled the laws, as you will note, through the regular sessions for 1915, and since that time we have compiled only the laws for 1921. There is a period of six years in which the laws of Massachusetts have not been compiled by this office. The same is true for the various other States in different degrees. For up to date information on the subject, therefore, it would be my suggestion that you take this matter up with each of the States which have State forestry departments.

I am inclosing a list of such departments for your information, if you wish to follow that course.

Very sincerely yours,

E. A. SHERMAN, Acting Forester.

PROVISIONS IN STATE LAWS PERTAINING TO TAXATION OF STATE-OWNED FORESTS

Massachusetts, through regular session, 1915: Land acquired under this act (L. 1914, ch. 720, which permits acquisition of lands for State forests) shall be exempt from taxation; but the Commonwealth shall reimburse cities and towns in which such lands are situated for taxes lost by reason of their acquisition in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of lands acquired for public institutions under the provisions of chapter 607 of the acts of the year 1910. (That chapter requires the tax commissioner beginning in the year 1910 and every fifth year thereafter, to deliver to the State treasurer a statement as to the value of lands owned by the State and used for public institutions in each city and town. The rate per thousand for which the State shall reimburse cities and towns is required to be equal to the average of the annual rates for the three preceding years. As amended by chapter 282, Laws of 1921, the assessed valuation of State forest lands every five years, beginning in 1925, shall be reduced by deducting therefrom the value of all forest products removed from such land between the 1st day of April on which it was last assessed, and the 1st day of April in the year in which the reimbursement is to be made.)

Michigan: Provision is made (act 116 of the Public Acts of 1917) for the payment yearly by the State into the treasury of each county in which is located any State-tax homestead or State swamp lands under the control and supervision of the Public Domain Commission a tax of 5 cents per acre, or major portion thereof, for all such lands as belong to the State, said funds to be expended upon trunk-line highways within the county, if there are such; otherwise upon the other highways of the county.

Minnesota: Itasca State Park: Forestry board is authorized to accept for the State of Minnesota donation of land within the limits of the park; and the donors may reserve to themselves for a period not exceeding 10 years from the date of such donation the right to cut and remove from the said lands all the white pine, Norway pine, jack pine, spruce, cedar, tamarack, and balsam timber 8 inches in diameter and over. All the taxes levied on such timber which the donors may reserve to themselves shall be paid by the State of Minnesota for a period not exceeding 10 years.

New Jersey, through regular session, 1915: The title of all lands acquired by the State for forestry reservations shall be taken in the name of the State, and all such forestry reservation lands shall be exempt from taxation from the time of their acquisition.

There shall be paid annually to the treasurer of each township or other municipality in which lands are held as State forest reserves, under the act to which this act is a supplement (L. 1905, 'ch. 47) the sum of 2 cents per acre for each acre of such reserve in said township or other municipality.

New York, through regular session, 1918: All wild or forest land within the forest preserve and also all such lands owned by the State in the towns of Altona and Dannemora, county of Clinton, except the lands in the town of Dannemora upon which buildings and inclosures are erected and maintained by the State for the use of State institutions, together with said buildings thereon, shall be assessed and taxed at a like valuation and rate as similar lands of individuals within the counties where situated. No tax for the erection of a schoolhouse or opening of a road shall be imposed on the State lands unless such erection or opening shall have first been approved in writing by the conservation commission.

North Carolina, through regular session, 1915: Said State forests shall be subject to county taxes assessed on the same basis as are private lands, to be paid out of moneys in the State treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Pennsylvania, through regular session, 1921: Fixed annual charge on State forests in lieu of taxes is made for the benefit of:

(1) Roads in the townships in which State forests are located, in the sum of 2 cents per acre.

(2) Schools in the respective districts in which the State forests are located, in the sum of 2 cents per acre, provided the said school districts shall each levy and collect a tax for the support of its schools of not less than 4 mills on the dollar of the assessed valuation of property in such district.

(3) Counties in which State forests are located, in the sum of 1 cent per acre.

In the case of auxiliary forest reserves (areas of privately owned land devoted exclusively to the growing of merchantable forest trees) the lands are subject to an annual charge (to be paid from State funds) of 2 cents per acre for the benefit of the schools, and 2 cents per acre for the benefit of the roads in the respective districts in which the reserves are located.

Vermont, through regular session, 1919: All lands held as State forest reserves shall be appraised under the provisions of section 722 of the General Laws and set to the State in the grand list of the town where located, and the State shall pay taxes thereon.

Wisconsin, through regular session, 1918: The said lands (State forest reserve) shall be included in the tax roll of each of said towns and shall be subject to taxation for all except State purposes at a rate not to exceed 1½ per cent of the assessed value in said several towns, and the State of Wisconsin hereby expressly consents to such taxation of such lands.

The following letters from Mr. Charles J. Gilmore, of Sacramento, Calif., are quite illuminating on this subject:

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., February 20, 1924.

Hon. JOHN E. RAKER, M. C.,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE: I am taking the liberty of writing you relative to your bill (H. R. 148) concerning reimbursement to the States by the United States for lands withdrawn for forestry purposes.

At the outset, please bear in mind that I favor, unqualifiedly, conservation of our natural resources. Let us not follow in the paths of our forefathers and destroy that natural wealth that an all-wise and beneficent Providence has bestowed upon us. Reforestation is, generally speaking, possible, but in no instance will second-growth timber equal in texture, fiber strength, or durability the primeval forest wood. Neither will all cut-over areas reforest even under the most advantageous conditions that the hand of man can provide. These two factors necessitate conserving the natural growth and the utilization of all forest products in accordance with the most modern and advanced scientific methods.

But to effectually provide for conservation to the degree that is demanded by the inroads made upon our natural forests and their constant decimation by their natural enemies—fire and insects—as well as the hand of man, some fair method of carrying the burden must be provided. It is not just nor equitable to require the political subdivisions wherein are situate those tax-free forest areas to continue being the physical repositories of the future timber supply for the benefit of the posterity of the whole United States.

The United States as a whole went into the World War, and the United States as a whole is paying the bill; the United States as a whole established the Fleet Corporation for the benefit of the shipping of the United States, and the United States as a whole is paying the bill. Who can say that the Kansas farmer or the Wyoming cattleman or the Nevada sheepman was directly interested in the affairs of the

Shipping Board or the merchant marine? Yet each must bear his proportionate part of the cost.

So it is with the forest problem. The same rules will apply. It may be that the New Yorker on Broadway is not a party in interest in the forest problem of California; but by the same rule of reasoning neither is the Kansas farmer, the Wyoming cattleman, nor the Nevada sheepman a party in interest in the affairs of the Nation that pertain to salt-water transportation. But the fact remains that the United States is one whole, indivisible political unit, and a benefit to the least of these is a benefit to the whole. The United States went into the business of reclaiming lands, notwithstanding that it was directly beneficial to only a few, but the expense of constructing those reclamation works and putting water on the land was taken from the contributions of the whole people in the United States.

The proposition submitted to Congress in your bill, No. 148, is not a departure from any established rule of the United States. On the contrary, ample precedents may be found to show that payment to the several States for losses incurred by reason of forest withdrawals is in line with the established policy of Congress. The act approved June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. 218), provided for the payment of delinquent taxes on the forfeited lands of the Oregon & California Railroad Co. situate in the States of Oregon and Washington. The act approved February 26, 1919 (40 Stat. 1179), made similar provisions as to lands within the forfeiture of the Coos Bay Wagon Road grant in Oregon. Further, it will be noted that the Congress provided for payment of such delinquent taxes on the basis of the returns of the county assessors. Thus we have an answer to the oft-repeated assertion that the States will have to revamp their assessment and tax-collecting methods if the United States will offer to pay any returns to the States upon a valuation of national-forest lands.

The ordinary demands of justice should require that the United States as a whole contribute to the cost of preservation and conservation of that future timber supply, at least to the same extent that the whole people must now contribute to the expense of Government maintenance in other lines. Nor can it be argued in defense of the present method of governmental control that the counties within which these vast tracts of Government-owned timberland are located directly reap the benefits of such withdrawals. You already have before you cold figures in refutation of that claim, and space prohibits me from recapitulating them. Suffice to say that prior to the expiration of the 75 or 100 years when it is estimated those areas will be cut over several of the forest counties in California will go out of business, and the county that will take over the bankrupt's affairs will obtain not an asset but a liability.

Considering every element concerned with the proposition and giving and granting to the opposition every fair vantage ground they can attain, I yet have to find one single logical argument against the enactment of your bill. It is not contrary to public policy, it is not unconstitutional, it is not unconscionable, it is not unfair, it is not inequitable, it is not any of the things that those opposed to it may impute to it. On the other hand, every theory of right, justice, law, equity, and fair dealing is in its favor.

I sincerely hope that whatever else may happen, that this measure will, before the end of this session, receive the approval of Congress and the signature of the President. It will right a grave wrong and a serious injustice that the United States is now and for some time last past has been visiting upon the forest counties of the 11 forested States.

With my kindest regards and sincere wishes for your continued success, I am

Very truly yours,

CHAS. L. GILMORE.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., May 5, 1924.

Hon. JOHN E. RAKER, M. C.,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE: Because of the great interest that is now being taken in your bill (H. R. 148) to provide reimbursement to forest States, and particularly since its indorsement, by resolution, by the northern district, State Federation of Women's Clubs, at Sacramento on April 29, 1924, I have received many calls for a copy of the bill from active working organizations in the several counties of this State.

Therefore I would like to know if it is possible to obtain 25 copies of the bill to the end that I can place them in this State, where they will do the most good.

If I may have that number, I will certainly appreciate their receipt.

With my kindest personal regards, wishing you continued success, I am

Very truly yours,

CHAS. L. GILMORE.

The northern district, State Federation of Women's Clubs in regular convention assembled at Sacramento, Calif., unanimously adopted the following resolution on April 30, 1924:

Whereas in withdrawing and placing within permanent national forests 18,891,161 acres of Government land within the State of Cali-

for the purpose of conserving national resources thereof, the United States Government has thereby withdrawn from all forms of State and county taxation standing timber and forage lands valued at \$146,599,866, according to the valuation of the United States Bureau of Public Roads; and

Whereas the 39 counties of California wherein is located this vast domain receive a mere pittance from sales of standing timber and fees for grazing permits, and said counties are required within that area to perform police powers, equip, maintain, and operate schools, equip, maintain, and operate courts for the punishment of offenders against the forest and other laws; construct, repair, and maintain roads and bridges, and to perform such other acts as may be necessary to the maintenance of good order and preservation of the public peace and security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the delegates of the State Federation of Women's Clubs, northern district, in regular convention assembled, indorse the principles of reimbursement as contained in H. R. 148, introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States on December 5, 1923, by Hon. JOHN E. RAKER, Member of Congress, representing the second congressional district of California, now pending before the House Committee on Public Lands to the effect that said forest counties are entitled to reimbursement by the United States in such sum as they would receive from the taxation of said lands of the United States within their respective borders if such lands were owned by individuals; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all Representatives in Congress from California and to Senators SHORTRIDGE and JOHNSON.

The United Chamber of Commerce of the Sacramento Valley at a meeting held in Sacramento December, 1923, discussed and finally indorsed what is known as the Hand plan for the reimbursement of forest counties by the Government. The plan is embodied in the Raker bill now before Congress and is familiar to all who have read the exchange of letters between Colonel Greeley and Charles E. Hand, as published in the Democrat. The plan is equitable.

The above appeared as an editorial in the Mountain Democrat of December 22, 1923, published at Placerville, Calif.

I am submitting the following letters, which discuss the plan set out in H. R. 8844 (H. R. 148):

MASON & STEVENS, FOREST ENGINEERS,
Portland, Oreg., February 8, 1924.

Judge JOHN E. RAKER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RAKER: Some correspondence has passed between Mr. C. E. Hand of Placerville, Calif., and myself with reference to H. R. 148, "a bill to provide compensation in lieu of taxes for the several States with respect to certain lands of the United States within the borders of said States, and for other purposes." I understand from Mr. Hand that some of this correspondence has been made available to you.

I am thoroughly in accord with the spirit of H. R. 148 and believe, further, that there is a very general and strong demand throughout the West for just this sort of legislation. This bill accomplishes what in my opinion is perhaps the greatest single step which can be taken toward a correct solution of our so-called forest problem. However, the whole subject should be recognized in its proper perspective. It seems to me that H. R. 148 might well recognize openly, as it does informally, that it is a substitute for the legislation which now is operative, which returns 25 per cent and then 10 per cent of the gross receipts of the Forest Service to the local communities in lieu of taxes. It must be recognized also, though this has no place in legislation, that the net return from H. R. 148 or similar legislation will not be greater by and large than that provided by the present law. The reimbursements as now provided do not fall at the right time nor in the right place. That is the only difficulty.

It seems to me that you might be able to win much more general support for this legislation with this idea quite openly in mind. The eastern Senators and Congressmen should be given to understand very plainly that what the West wants is not more payment on account of these lands but payment at the right time to be helpful to the greatest possible extent. It strikes me, too, that you might find Senator McNARY quite open on this point and perhaps willing to help out by the introduction of similar legislation in the Senate. This is not only on account of his S. 1553, "for relief of Lincoln County, Oreg.," but because he sometime ago advanced the idea that the present 25 per cent return from gross revenues should be doubled. I believe that he found Colonel Greeley not unresponsive to his suggestion.

Congress in its recent investigations, seeking to learn by what means the Federal Government might best help on this so-called forest problem, should have been everywhere confronted by the idea in H. R. 148. I am certainly glad to note that you yourself have so correctly analyzed the situation, and I certainly wish you the best of success with your bill.

Cordially yours,

CARL M. STEVENS.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., January 12, 1923.

Hon. JOHN E. RAKER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR RAKER: Since I saw you in Sacramento I have given some study and thought to your bill providing for taxation of national-forest resources, and I feel that I was mistaken in making the suggestion that the taxation should be on an acreage basis. The appraisal of these resources by the United States Bureau of Public Roads shows a great difference in values in the different counties, which would make it inequitable to pay 10 cents per acre to all counties. After all, the only equitable basis is on the valuation, and there is no reason why property owned by the Government should be on a different basis from privately owned property. For these reasons, after giving your bill careful reconsideration, I have no suggestions to make in the way of amendments.

During the past three months I have had opportunity to talk this matter over with quite a number of interested people—timber owners, stockmen, and others—and all agree that something should be done along the line provided by your bill; but practically all seem to think it is hopeless, especially on account of the preponderance of influence of eastern States in the House. However, it is my belief that if we stick to this proposition we can finally put it over, as there is no question that it is absolutely just and right and fair to our mountain counties.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

GEO. H. RHODES.

PLACERVILLE, CALIF., March 23, 1924.

Hon. JOHN E. RAKER, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE RAKER: I understand the reforestation matter is coming up for hearing in committee soon, and I hope the committee will properly consider the merits of the claim of the forest counties for adequate reimbursement for taxes lost to the counties by reason of the fact that national-forest land is perpetually withdrawn from settlement and taxation. We believe in conservation, but we believe the expense should be shared by all who benefit, and not alone by poor counties like this. Some say the 25 per cent of the gross receipts we get is adequate, but the fallacy of that is shown by the fact that we would gladly give this 25 per cent in exchange for taxes at the rate paid by similar private lands. Then we should have a fixed amount to depend on and not risk having a feast or famine as timber sales may be heavy or light.

Wishing you the fullest measure of success in your advocacy of adequate reimbursement, I am,

Sincerely yours,

H. E. DILLINGER.

PLACERVILLE, CALIF., February 25, 1924.

Hon. JOHN E. RAKER, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE: Your bill No. 148, to compensate forest counties, is a step in the right direction, and, to my mind, will solve the problem of forest taxation.

For eight years I was county auditor of a county in which the Federal Government has set aside large areas of forest lands; in fact, 34 per cent of the total area of the county was Government-owned forest lands, not open to entry and therefore not subject to taxation. As auditor it was my duty to prepare the annual budget, and due to the fact that such large areas were set aside and not on our tax rolls placed such a burden on what remained subject to taxation that it made the matter of raising sufficient moneys to support county government very difficult indeed. This was very apparent when it came to bond issues for public improvement, and our people have always been of the opinion that inasmuch as the national forests are for the benefit of all of the people of the Nation the burden should be borne by all those who are receiving the benefits. This, to my mind, is the only just way.

In the event your bill should become the law the forest counties would automatically relinquish the 25 per cent they are now receiving from the sales of forest resources and the Federal Government would retain for its own use all moneys received from this source, and in the long run the Federal Government would be compensated. What is necessary is immediate relief of forest townships and counties, and your bill furnishes the needed relief. The local taxing unit can not and should not be expected to carry this burden for 75 or 100 years while the trees are growing with no returns therefrom. This is a matter for the Federal Government and not one for the sparsely settled forest county.

The exchange bills having been passed and now operative, the private owner is rapidly exchanging cut-over lands for standing timber, and in each case where this is done the county must not only stand the loss of the taxes each year on the lands so exchanged but must also lose the 25 per cent on the timber, and this condition will continue without any returns to the county from such lands during the period

of reforestation, which will require in the pine country in the neighborhood of 100 years before anything like matured timber can be cut from such lands.

Yours sincerely,

TED C. ATWOOD.

CALIFORNIA METAL AND MINERAL PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION,
San Francisco, April 10, 1924.

Mr. CHARLES HAND,
Placerville, Calif.

DEAR SIR: We are advised by Mr. Rhodes, of this city, that you are sponsoring bill H. R. 11789, introduced by Congressman RAKER, providing for the taxation of the national forest reserves within the several States.

This appears to be a meritorious measure, and I would be pleased to have copies of any statistical matter that you may have in support of the bill for the consideration of the board of directors of this association at a meeting to be held in the near future.

Yours most truly,

ROBT. I. KEER, Secretary-Treasurer.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Friday evening, between the hours of 8 and 11 o'clock, it shall be in order to consider bills on the Private Calendar unobjected to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that it shall be in order on Friday evening next, from 8 until 11 o'clock, to consider bills on the Private Calendar unobjected to. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, there is no objection to that, but I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks it probable that we can at some time not too remote have a period in which we can consider those bills on the Private Calendar that are objected to?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I shall be glad to talk with the gentleman about that.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I understand a bill has been reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds—and there is a similar bill which has passed the Senate—accepting a tract of 70 acres of land from a citizen in Washington for park purposes. In case that tract of land is accepted by the Congress, there is a wealthy lady here who is to give another park connecting the former one with the Potomac River. It is very important that that bill should be passed immediately. Could not the gentleman arrange to have that bill come up before the House to-morrow morning?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I had not heard of the bill before.

Mr. BLANTON. There is no opposition to it at all, and it is a mere question of accepting a gift. The committee has looked into it carefully. I have looked all over the proposition myself, and I know it is to the interest of the District to accept the park, because we will get another one that adjoins it from a very rich lady here.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I would like to have an opportunity to consult the Speaker before doing that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Longworth]?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Speaker, apropos of the requests for time to make speeches on Wednesday, I ask permission to be absent from the House on that day on important business.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is granted. There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, May 13, 1924, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

409. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplementary report in response to House Resolution 51, regarding purchase of a site for a Federal building in Kenosha, Wis., said site to cost about \$110,000 instead of \$140,000 previously estimated; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

470. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropria-

tion for the office of the Superintendent, State, War, and Navy Department Buildings, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and to remain available until June 30, 1925, for rebuilding elevators, \$25,000 (H. Doc. No. 272); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

471. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation pertaining to the legislative establishment of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, for "contingent expenses, United States Senate: Miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, \$50,000" (H. Doc. No. 273); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. MCKENZIE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 9124. A bill authorizing the sale of real property no longer required for military purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 710). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WURZBACH: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1539. A bill for the relief of Caleb Aber; without amendment (Rept. No. 711). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BLACK of New York: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2745. A bill for the relief of J. M. Farrell; without amendment (Rept. No. 712). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3595. A bill for the relief of Daniel F. Healy; with an amendment (Rept. No. 713). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EDMONDS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8343. A bill for the relief of Jim Hennessee; without amendment (Rept. No. 714). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KNUTSON: Committee on Pensions. H. R. 9178. A bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; without amendment (Rept. No. 715). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9131) for the relief of Martha Janowitz, and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SPROUL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 9173) providing for the furnishing of cars to shippers, receiving freight for shipment and the prompt transportation of same, the making and publishing of rules for the transporting of freight, and prescribing penalties for a violation thereof, and for other purposes, in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 9174) to establish the Mena National Park in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LINEBERGER: A bill (H. R. 9175) to protect the coastal navigable waters of the United States from obstruction and injury by prohibiting the discharge therein of oil from vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GASQUE: A bill (H. R. 9176) granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Marion and Florence, in the State of South Carolina, to construct a bridge across the Pee-dee River at or near Allison's Ferry, S. C.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 9177) granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Kittitas and Grant, in the State of Washington, to construct a bridge across the Columbia River at or near Vantage Ferry, Wash.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 9178) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; committed to the Committee of the Whole House.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 9179) to punish the unlawful transmission in interstate commerce or through the mails of gambling machines, fraudulent devices, pistols, and revolvers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 9180) to amend subsections (1), (2), and (3) of section 302 of the war risk insurance act, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 9181) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved September 21, 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLIGAN: A bill (H. R. 9182) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as amended June 29, 1906, April 13, 1908, June 18, 1910, February 17, 1917, March 2, 1917, May 29, 1917, August 10, 1917, and February 28, 1920; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLAND (by request): Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 262) to authorize the United States Shipping Board to adjust the claim of the Near East Relief; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BEEDY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 263) establishing a commission for the participation of the United States in an appropriate commemoration of the Lafayette Centenary, authorizing an appropriation to be utilized in connection with such observance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BERGER: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 22) calling upon the President of the United States to invite the representatives of nations which are signatories to the treaty of Versailles to attend an international conference to revise the terms of the treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CONNERY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts petitioning Congress to enact legislation to prevent the manufacture of shoes in factories owned by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island indorsing the passage by Congress of House bill 1, relating to the crime of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 9183) granting an increase of pension to Harriet E. Tally; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9184) granting a pension to Mary A. Patton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNERY: A bill (H. R. 9185) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the Overseas Post, No. 240, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Lynn, Mass., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 9186) granting a pension to Mary A. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 9187) granting a pension to John U. Coker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANHAM: A bill (H. R. 9188) granting a pension to Josie Hicks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9189) granting a pension to Catherine W. Crockett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 9190) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Coleman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9191) granting a pension to Artie Noles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

* Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2725. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Board of Estimates and Apportionment, City of New York, opposing proposal now pending in the United States Senate to place a 10 per cent tax on sale of radio sets and parts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2726. By Mr. CONNERY: Petition of Sons of American Revolution, indorsing restoration and repairing of the frigate *Constitution*; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2727. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Family Welfare Society, of Boston, Mass., recommending early and favorable con-

sideration of House bill 487, known as the Fitzgerald accident compensation bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2728. Also, petition of American War Veterans' Association of City of Boston and County of Suffolk Employees, Boston, Mass.; also petition Vicinity Council No. 1, Department of Massachusetts, United Spanish War Veterans, Chelsea, Mass., urging passage of Bursum bill over President's veto; to the Committee on Pensions.

2729. Also, petition of Old Colony Lodge, No. 143, Brotherhood of Railroad and Steamship Clerks, Boston, Mass., recommending early passage of the Howell-Barkley bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2730. By Mr. LINEBERGER: Petition of Charlotte M. Knox and others, in favor of the eighteenth amendment and Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2731. Also, petition of Mrs. Gertrude E. Fuller and others, in support of equal rights amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2732. Also, petition of Thurborn E. Towle and others, favoring the passage of House bill 3683; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2733. By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Petition of Minneapolis Chapter, No. 1, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, in opposition to the ruling of the United States Veterans' Bureau that requires two years' premedical schooling for entrance into the study of chiropractic, and urging the repeal of this rule; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2734. Also, petition of the Saturday Lunch Club of Minneapolis, that the United States shall not engage in or prepare for offensive warfare and that our Government call upon all nations to make similar declaration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2735. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Clerks' Association, Operating Department, Pennsylvania Railroad system, Elmira, N. Y., opposing further measures of regulatory legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2736. Also, petition of Fresno Federal Business Association, Fresno, Calif., resolution urging Federal Government to put into use confiscated boats and automobiles; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2737. Also, petition of Fred Detmers, Los Angeles, Calif., in re tax on articles of jewelry, including spectacles and eye glasses, in excess of \$25 in value; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2738. Also, petition of Second Church of Christ, Scientist, New Orleans, La., resolution calling for a constitutional amendment for world peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2739. Also, petition of United Veterans' Council, San Francisco, Calif., urging passage of Bursum bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2740. Also, petition of Hollenbeck Ebell Club, Los Angeles, Calif., in re Senate bill 2313, relative to the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

2741. Also, petition of Harry Arrivee, State Soldiers' Home, Ohio, urging the appointment of a liquor commission to control the manufacture, sale, and consumption of all intoxicants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2742. Also, petition of David C. Mills, National Association of the Fur Industry, New York City, in re House bills 5949 and 745; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

TUESDAY, May 13, 1924

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank Thee for the sunlight of the morning. Grant that our hearts may be filled with the sunlight of Thy presence, and that we may realize how good it is to live, our whole being throbbing with the purpose of living rightly, of fulfilling the tasks given unto us, and so engaging our occupations with the high purposes of Thy will that we may be to others an example of righteous endeavor to do that which shall be for the best of our loved land and all who are near and dear to us. We ask in Jesus Christ's name. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.